arXiv:1608.06422v1 [math.OC] 23 Aug 2016

Schur Method for Robust Pole Assignment of Descriptor Systems via Proportional Plus Derivative State Feedback

Zhen-Chen Guo [a]

[a] *Shing-Tung Yau Center, College of Sciences, National Chiao Tung University, Hsinchu 30010, Taiwan, R.O.C.*

Abstract

The pole assignment problem for descriptor systems is a classical inverse algebraic eigenvalue problem, which has attracted attention for decades. In this paper, we propose a direct method to solve the problem with the application of the proportional plus derivative state feedback, intending to obtain a robust closed-loop system. Theorems on the feasibility of our method will be presented. Numerical examples show that our method yields poles of high relative accuracy.

Key words: descriptor system; robust pole assignment; proportional plus derivative state feedback; generalized real Schur form.

1 Introduction

Consider the linear time-invariant dynamical system

$$E\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Bu(t), \tag{1}$$

where $E, A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$, $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are the state and the input, respectively. The system is referred to as a descriptor system and has found a variety of applications, such as chemical processes and electrical network control [9,23,30]. With a generally singular E, (1) is an algebraic-differential equation which attracts much recent interests. Introduced in [26], studies of (1) include several meaningful mathematical problems, motivated intrinsically from the associated engineering design, such as its controllability, regularization, pole assignment and so on. Please refer to [2–7,11–14,16, 17,19–29,31,33–38] and the references therein for more information.

When the infinity index $\mathrm{ind}_\infty(A, E)$ (or the maximal size of the Jordan blocks in the Weierstrass canonical form of the matrix pair (A, E) or equivalently the matrix pencil $A - \lambda E$ corresponding to its infinite generalized eigenvalue) is no greater than 1 and (A, E) is regular, the algebraic part (or the associated redundant variables) in (1) can be eliminated, resulting in a standard linear system (with a nonsingular E) of reduced order. In contrary, systems with $\mathrm{ind}_\infty(A, E) > 1$ might lost causality for some insufficiently smooth inputs. Consequently, one hopes to obtain a regular closed-loop system with an infinity index being no greater than 1 after applying feedback. Fortunately, authors in [3] have shown that, if (E, A, B) is strongly controllable (or S-controllable), a proportional plus derivative state feedback (PD-SF) exists for such a design goal.

Regarding the pole assignment problem, which is of some importance for system design, the dynamical behaviour of (1) fundamentally depends on the eigen-structure of (A, E), especially the eigenvalues [3]. When only the state is available, the proportional state feedback will be adopted [21]; if the derivative of the state can be measured, we may apply the derivative state feedback [1]. When both are procurable, we may employ a PD-SF [14]. All these state feedback designs are also applicable for output feedback.

It is worthwhile to point out that a state feedback involving derivatives has some advantages over one without. More specifically, by modifying E to $E + BG$ for some $G \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$, we could regularize the closed-loop descriptor system, assigning $\mathrm{rank}([\,E\ B\,])$ finite poles meanwhile shifting some infinite ones. Consequently, (1) may be converted into a standard one of reduced order, under certain conditions, eliminating the algebraic part.

For the multi-input system (i.e., $m > 1$), many different PD-SFs lead to regular closed-loop systems, which has an infinity index no higher than 1 and the finite eigenvalues are r specified complex numbers (closed under complex conjugation), with $\mathrm{rank}(E) \le r \le \mathrm{rank}([\,E\ B\,])$. In

Email address: guozhch06@gmail.com (Zhen-Chen Guo).

applications, one may prefer a PD-SF which produces a robust closed-loop system. Applying the regularization results in [3], we will focus on the *robust pole assignment problem via the proportional plus derivative state feedback (RPA-PDSF)*, which is stated as follows:

RPA-PDSF: For given $E, A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$ with (E, A, B) being S-controllable, and an arbitrarily set $\mathfrak{L} = \{(\alpha_1, 0), \ldots, (\alpha_{n-r}, 0); (\alpha_{n-r+1}, \beta_{n-r+1}), \ldots, (\alpha_n, \beta_n)\}$, closed under complex conjugation, where $\beta_j \neq 0$ for $j = n-r+1, \ldots, n$, with $q - m \leq r \leq q$, $q \triangleq \text{rank}([\,E\ B\,])$, find a pair of matrices $G, F \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$, such that $(A+BF, E+BG)$ is regular, $\text{ind}_\infty(A+BF, E+BG) \leq 1$, the spectrum $\lambda(A+BF, E+BG) = \mathfrak{L}$ and the obtained closed-loop system is robust, that is, the eigenvalues of $(A+BF, E+BG)$ are as insensitive to perturbations on $(A+BF, E+BG)$ as possible.

Here we represent an eigenvalue $\lambda_j = \alpha_j/\beta_j$ by the ordered-pair (α_j, β_j), eliminating the distinction between finite and infinite eigenvalues. Note that (α_j, β_j) is a representative of an equivalence class defined by the relation $\sim$, where $(\alpha_i, \beta_i) \sim (\alpha_j, \beta_j) \Leftrightarrow \alpha_i\beta_j = \alpha_j\beta_i$. Without loss of generality, we restrict $\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_{n-r}$ to be real.

Adopting different measures of robustness, different methods were proposed to solve the *RPA-PDSF*. Two frequently used measures are the condition number of the eigenvectors matrix [35] and the departure from normality [25]. When (1) is completely controllable (C-controllable), adopting the condition numbers of the left and right eigenvector matrices of $(A+BF, E+BG)$ as the measure, [35] solved the *RPA-PDSF* through a series of generalized Sylvester equations and the Weierstrass canonical form of $(A+BF, E+BG)$. Arbitrary pole placement were permitted, under the harsh assumption that the sizes of all the Jordan blocks (for both finite and infinite eigenvalues) are known *a priori*. Computing the Weierstrass canonical form would also cause some numerical instability in general. Furthermore, the accuracy in solving the generalized Sylvester equations relies on a wide separation between $\lambda(A, E)$ and $\lambda(A+BF, E+BG)$, thus placing an unreasonable demand. (After all, why should some well-behaved poles not allowed to remain?) Recently, a Schur-Newton method was proposed in [25], minimizing the departure from normality of $(A+BF, E+BG)$. With the generalized Schur form $(A+BF, E+BG) = (XSP, XTP)$, where $X, P \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ are nonsingular, $S, T \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ are upper quasi-triangular and all finite poles are real, the method in [25] generates an orthogonal P. For complex conjugate poles, the acquired P is usually not orthogonal, implying that it virtually does not optimize the departure from normality of $(A+BF, E+BG)$. Both methods are iterative and convergence are not proven.

In [14], Duan and Patton employed the proportional plus partial derivative state feedback, with the closed-loop system in the form $(A+BF, E+BGC)$ for $C \in \mathbb{R}^{l\times n}$ being the output matrix. Adopting a sum of the condition numbers of individual eigenvalues as the robust measure, the method assigns n distinct finite poles, requiring the existence of $G \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times l}$ with $\text{rank}(E+BGC) = n$. However, no sufficient and necessary condition is offered to guarantee such existence. Besides, the method essentially computes the right coprime polynomial matrices $N(s)$ and $D(s)$ such that $(A-sE)N(s) + BD(s) = 0$ [10], which is theoretically elegant yet numerically difficult to implement.

Inspired by the algorithms `schur` [8] and `Schur-rob` [18], we propose a direct method to solve the *RPA-PDSF*, utilizing the generalized real Schur form of $(A+BF, E+BG)$ in this paper. We shall adopt a robustness measure which is closely related to the departure from normality. All poles will be placed in turn, and in each step (which assigns an infinite pole, a real pole or a pair of complex conjugate poles), we minimize the robust measure in an optimization subproblem. When assigning an infinite pole, we merely need to solve some linear equations; while assigning a real pole, only a singular value decomposition (SVD) is required. When assigning a pair of complex conjugate poles, similarly to `Schur-rob`, an efficient solution of the corresponding optimization sub-problem is proposed. In addition, theorems will be proved to guarantee the feasibility of our method. Abundant amount of numerical results will show the feasibility and efficiency of our method, producing robust closed-loop systems with highly accurate finite poles.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present some preliminaries. Our method is developed in Section 3, for the assignment of infinite poles, real finite poles and complex conjugate finite poles. Numerical results are reported in Section 4. Some concluding remarks are then made in Section 5.

2 Notations and Preliminaries

Throughout this paper, for an arbitrary matrix M, we denote the null space, the range space and the submatrix comprised by rows k to l and columns s to t by $\mathcal{N}(M)$, $\mathcal{R}(M)$ and $M(k:l, s:t)$, respectively. For any arbitrary $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, define $D_0(\lambda) \equiv \begin{bmatrix} \text{Re}(\lambda) & \text{Im}(\lambda) \\ -\text{Im}(\lambda) & \text{Re}(\lambda) \end{bmatrix}$, $D_\delta(\lambda) \equiv \begin{bmatrix} \text{Re}(\lambda) & \delta\text{Im}(\lambda) \\ -\delta^{-1}\text{Im}(\lambda) & \text{Re}(\lambda) \end{bmatrix}$ with some $0 \neq \delta \in \mathbb{R}$. We adopt "offdiag($T$)" for the strictly upper triangular part of a matrix T.

Lemma 1 *For any regular matrix pencil (A, E), $A, E \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, there exist a nonsingular matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ and*

an orthogonal matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ such that $X^{-1}AP = S$ and $X^{-1}EP = T$ are both upper quasi-triangular with 1×1 or 2×2 diagonal blocks. Moreover, writing the block diagonal parts of S and T as $\Phi = \mathrm{diag}(\Phi_{11}, \ldots, \Phi_{kk})$ and $\Psi = \mathrm{diag}(\Psi_{11}, \ldots, \Psi_{kk})$, respectively, the 1×1 diagonal blocks are $\Phi_{jj} = \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{\alpha^2+\beta^2}}$ and $\Psi_{jj} = \frac{\beta}{\sqrt{\alpha^2+\beta^2}}$, corresponding to some real eigenvalue (α, β) (with $\beta = 0$ indicating a classical infinite eigenvalue). The 2×2 diagonal blocks corresponds to some complex conjugate eigenvalues $\{(\alpha,\beta),(\bar\alpha,\bar\beta)\}$ $(\alpha\beta \neq 0)$ with $\Phi_{jj} = I_2$, $\Psi_{jj} = D_\delta(\sigma + i\tau)$ if $|\alpha| \geq |\beta|$, or $\Phi_{jj} = D_\delta(\tilde\sigma + i\tilde\tau)$, $\Psi_{jj} = I_2$ if $|\alpha| < |\beta|$, where $\sigma = \frac{\mathrm{Re}(\bar\alpha\beta)}{|\alpha|^2}$, $\tau = \frac{\mathrm{Im}(\bar\alpha\beta)}{|\alpha|^2}$, $\tilde\sigma = \frac{\mathrm{Re}(\bar\beta\alpha)}{|\beta|^2}$, $\tilde\tau = \frac{\mathrm{Im}(\bar\beta\alpha)}{|\beta|^2}$, $0 \neq \delta \in \mathbb{R}$.

PROOF. For the infinite pole $(1, 0)$, let $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the vector satisfying $Ev = 0$ and $\|v\|_2 = 1$. Then it holds that $Av \neq 0$ since (A, E) is regular. Define $u \equiv \frac{1}{\|Av\|_2^2}Av$ and denote the orthonormal basis of the orthogonal complement subspaces of $\mathcal{R}(v)$ and $\mathcal{R}(u)$ by $V_\perp$ and $U_\perp$, respectively. With $U \equiv [\, u\ U_\perp\,]$, $V \equiv [\, v\ V_\perp\,]$, we obviously have

$$U^\top AV = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & * \\ 0 & A_1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad U^\top EV = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & * \\ 0 & E_1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

For the real normalized eigenvector v corresponding to the finite real eigenvalue (α, β) with $\beta \neq 0$, we have $\beta Av = \alpha Ev$ with $Ev \neq 0$. With $u \equiv \frac{\beta}{\sqrt{\alpha^2+\beta^2}\|Ev\|_2^2}Ev$, construct $V_\perp, U_\perp$ and the orthogonal V, U similarly. It then follows that

$$U^\top AV = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{\alpha^2+\beta^2}} & * \\ 0 & A_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad U^\top EV = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\beta}{\sqrt{\alpha^2+\beta^2}} & * \\ 0 & E_2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

For the complex eigenvector $v = x + iy$ $(x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n)$ corresponding to the eigenvalue $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{C}\times\mathbb{C}$ $(\alpha\beta \neq 0)$, it follows from $\beta Av = \alpha Ev$ that $[\, Ax\ Ay\,]D_0(\beta) = [\, Ex\ Ey\,]D_0(\alpha)$. Clearly, x and y are linearly independent, else $(\alpha, \beta) \notin \mathbb{C}\times\mathbb{C}$. Let $\tilde x$ and $\tilde y$ be the result of the Jacobi orthogonal transformation on x and y [18], i.e., $[\, \tilde x\ \tilde y\,] = [\, x\ y\,]\left[\begin{smallmatrix} c & s \\ -s & c \end{smallmatrix}\right]$ (with c and s being the cosine and sine of some angle). Denote $v_1 \equiv \tilde x/\|\tilde x\|_2$, $v_2 \equiv \tilde y/\|\tilde y\|_2$, then we have $A[\, v_1\ v_2\,]D_\delta(\beta) = E[\, v_1\ v_2\,]D_\delta(\alpha)$ with $\delta = \|\tilde x\|_2/\|\tilde y\|_2$. Let $V_\perp \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times(n-2)}$ be the matrix satisfying $V_\perp^\top v_1 = V_\perp^\top v_2 = 0$ and $V_\perp^\top V_\perp = I_{n-2}$, then $V = [\, v_1\ v_2\ V_\perp\,]$ is orthogonal. Obviously, $1 \leq \dim(\mathcal{R}([\, Av_1\ Av_2\,])) \leq 2$. Define $U_\perp \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times(n-2)}$ as the matrix which satisfies $U_\perp^\top[\, Av_1\ Av_2\,] = 0$ and $U_\perp^\top U_\perp = I_{n-2}$, and let $\{w_1, w_2\}$ be a real orthonormal basis of the orthogonal complement subspace of $\mathcal{R}(U_\perp)$. If $|\alpha| \geq |\beta|$, define

$$\begin{bmatrix} u_1 & u_2 \end{bmatrix} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} w_1 & w_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_1^\top Av_1 & w_2^\top Av_1 \\ w_1^\top Av_2 & w_2^\top Av_2 \end{bmatrix}^{-1},$$

otherwise

$$\begin{bmatrix} u_1 & u_2 \end{bmatrix} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} w_1 & w_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_1^\top Ev_1 & w_2^\top Ev_1 \\ w_1^\top Ev_2 & w_2^\top Ev_2 \end{bmatrix}^{-1}.$$

Denote the nonsingular $U = [\, u_1\ u_2\ U_\perp\,]$, we have

$$U^\top AV = \begin{bmatrix} I_2 & * \\ 0 & A_3 \end{bmatrix}, \quad U^\top EV = \begin{bmatrix} D_\delta(\sigma + i\tau) & * \\ 0 & E_3 \end{bmatrix}$$

if $|\alpha| \geq |\beta|$, or

$$U^\top AV = \begin{bmatrix} D_\delta(\tilde\sigma + i\tilde\tau) & * \\ 0 & A_3 \end{bmatrix}, \quad U^\top EV = \begin{bmatrix} I_2 & * \\ 0 & E_3 \end{bmatrix}$$

if $|\alpha| < |\beta|$.

Repeat the above process on (A_1, E_1), (A_2, E_2) or (A_3, E_3), we eventually obtain the result.

Note 1 *Suppose that $\mathrm{ind}_\infty(A, E) \leq 1$, or the infinite eigenvalues of (A, E) are semi-simple, then when all the diagonal block parts corresponding to the infinite eigenvalues are collected together, we have $T_{pq} = 0$ for $p = j, \ldots, j + l$ and $q = p + 1, \ldots, j + l$.*

When $\Psi_{jj} = D_{\delta_j}(\sigma_j + i\tau_j)$ and $\Phi_{ll} = D_{\delta_l}(\tilde\sigma_l + i\tilde\tau_l)$, let $\Psi_{jj} = W_{jj}^*\left[\begin{smallmatrix} \sigma_j+i\tau_j & \zeta_j \\ & \sigma_j-i\tau_j \end{smallmatrix}\right]W_{jj}$ and $\Phi_{ll} = \widetilde W_{ll}^*\left[\begin{smallmatrix} \tilde\sigma_l+i\tilde\tau_l & \tilde\zeta_l \\ & \tilde\sigma_l-i\tilde\tau_l \end{smallmatrix}\right]\widetilde W_{ll}$ be the Schur decompositions of Φ_{jj} and Ψ_{ll}, respectively. Direct calculations show that $\zeta_j = (\delta_j - \frac{1}{\delta_j})\tau_j$ and $\tilde\zeta_l = (\delta_l - \frac{1}{\delta_l})\tilde\tau_l$. Now define $Z \equiv \mathrm{diag}(Z_{11}, \ldots, Z_{kk}) \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$, $D \equiv \mathrm{diag}(D_{11}, \ldots, D_{kk}) \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$, where (i) $Z_{jj} = 1$, $D_{jj} = 1$ if the size of Φ_{jj} equals to 1; (ii) $Z_{jj} = W_{jj}$, $D_{jj} = (1 + \sigma_j^2 + \tau_j^2)^{-1/2}I_2$ if $\Phi_{jj} = I_2$; or (iii) $Z_{jj} = \widetilde W_{jj}$, $D_{jj} = (1 + \tilde\sigma_j^2 + \tilde\tau_j^2)^{-1/2}I_2$ if $\Psi_{jj} = I_2$. It then holds that $DZSZ^*$ and $DZTZ^*$ are both upper triangular with the diagonal elements satisfying $|(DZSZ^*)_{jj}|^2 + |(DZTZ^*)_{jj}|^2 = 1$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n$.

By writing S and T in partitioned form, i.e.,

$$S=\begin{bmatrix}\Phi_{11} & S_{12} & \cdots & S_{1k}\\ & \Phi_{22} & \cdots & S_{2k}\\ & & \ddots & \vdots\\ & & & \Phi_{kk}\end{bmatrix},\quad T=\begin{bmatrix}\Psi_{11} & T_{12} & \cdots & T_{1k}\\ & \Psi_{22} & \cdots & T_{2k}\\ & & \ddots & \vdots\\ & & & \Psi_{kk}\end{bmatrix},$$

it follows from the definition of Z and D that

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\operatorname{offdiag}(DZSZ^*)\|_F^2+\|\operatorname{offdiag}(DZTZ^*)\|_F^2\\ &=\sum\nolimits_{1\times 1\text{blocks}}\sum_{l>j}(|S_{jl}|^2+|T_{jl}|^2)+\\ &\sum\nolimits_{2\times 2\text{blocks}}^{|\alpha_j|\geq|\beta_j|}\frac{\sum_{l>j}(\|S_{jl}\|_F^2+\|T_{jl}\|_F^2)+(\delta_j^2-1)^2\delta_j^{-2}\tau_j^2}{1+\sigma_j^2+\tau_j^2}+\\ &\sum\nolimits_{2\times 2\text{blocks}}^{|\alpha_j|<|\beta_j|}\frac{\sum_{l>j}(\|S_{jl}\|_F^2+\|T_{jl}\|_F^2)+(\delta_j^2-1)^2\delta_j^{-2}\tilde\tau_j^2}{1+\tilde\sigma_j^2+\tilde\tau_j^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, for those 2×2 blocks $D_\delta(\sigma_j+i\tau_j)$ corresponding to $|\alpha_j|\geq|\beta_j|$, it holds that

$$\sigma_j^2+\tau_j^2=\frac{|\bar\alpha_j\beta_j|^2}{|\alpha_j|^4}=\frac{|\beta_j|^2}{|\alpha_j|^2}\leq 1,$$

leading to $1\leq 1+\sigma_j^2+\tau_j^2\leq 2$. Analogously, we also have $1\leq 1+\tilde\sigma_j^2+\tilde\tau_j^2\leq 2$. Now denote

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_F^2(A,E)\equiv\|S-\Phi\|_F^2+\|T-\Psi\|_F^2+\\ \sum\nolimits_{2\times 2\text{blocks}}^{|\alpha_j|\geq|\beta_j|}\tau_j^2\left(\delta_j-\frac{1}{\delta_j}\right)^2+\\ \sum\nolimits_{2\times 2\text{blocks}}^{|\alpha_j|<|\beta_j|}\tilde\tau_j^2\left(\delta_j-\frac{1}{\delta_j}\right)^2,\end{aligned}\quad(2)$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\Delta_F^2(A,E)\\ &\quad\leq\|\operatorname{offdiag}(DZSZ^*)\|_F^2+\|\operatorname{offdiag}(DZTZ^*)\|_F^2\\ &\qquad\leq\Delta_F^2(A,E).\end{aligned}$$

From the Henrici-type theorem [15] for the sensitivity of generalized eigenvalues, we know from Lemma 1 that $\Delta_F^2(A+BF,E+BG)$ will be an appropriate robust measure for the closed-loop system or the corresponding *RPA-PDSF*.

Next we quote the following solvability result for the *RPA-PDSF*.

Lemma 2 *([3]) For the S-controllable descriptor system (E,A,B), a positive integer r satisfying $q-m\leq r\leq q\triangleq\operatorname{rank}([\,E\ B\,])$, and an arbitrary set $\mathfrak{L}=\{(\alpha_1,0),\ldots,(\alpha_{n-r},0),(\alpha_{n-r+1},\beta_{n-r+1}),\ldots,(\alpha_n,\beta_n)\}$ with $\{(\alpha_{n-r+1},\beta_{n-r+1}),\ldots,(\alpha_n,\beta_n)\}$ being self-conjugate and $\beta_j\neq 0$ $(j=n-r+1,\ldots,n)$, there exist $G,F\in\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ which solve the* RPA-PDSF.

For such $G,F\in\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ in Lemma 2, it follows from Lemma 1 that there always exist a nonsingular matrix $X_{G,F}\in\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ and an orthogonal matrix $P_{G,F}\in\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ such that

$$X_{G,F}^{-1}(A+BF)P_{G,F}=S=\begin{array}{c}\\ n-r\\ r\end{array}\begin{array}{c}\begin{array}{cc}n-r & r\end{array}\\ \begin{bmatrix}S_{11} & S_{12}\\ & S_{22}\end{bmatrix}\end{array},\quad(3)$$

$$X_{G,F}^{-1}(E+BG)P_{G,F}=T=\begin{array}{c}\\ n-r\\ r\end{array}\begin{array}{c}\begin{array}{cc}n-r & r\end{array}\\ \begin{bmatrix}0 & T_{12}\\ & T_{22}\end{bmatrix}\end{array},\quad(4)$$

where all the diagonal elements in S_{11} are 1 and $\lambda(S_{22},T_{22})=\{(\alpha_{n-r+1},\beta_{n-r+1}),\ldots,(\alpha_n,\beta_n)\}$. The choice of $T_{11}=0$ in (4) is justified in the Note above. We shall utilize the decomposition in (3) and (4) to solve the *RPA-PDSF*.

Let $P_{G,F}=[\,p_1\ \cdots\ p_n\,]$, $X_{G,F}=[\,x_1\ \cdots\ x_n\,]$, and define $N_S\equiv[\,\breve v_{1,S}\ \cdots\ \breve v_{n,S}\,]$ and $N_T\equiv[\,\breve v_{1,T}\ \cdots\ \breve v_{n,T}\,]$ as the strictly upper quasi-triangular parts of S and T, respectively. In other words, we have $\breve v_{j,S}=[\,v_{j,S}^\top\ 0\,]^\top$ with $v_{j,S}\in\mathbb{R}^{j-1}$ or $\mathbb{R}^{j-2}$ $(j=2,\cdots,n)$, and $\breve v_{j,T}=[\,v_{j,T}^\top\ 0\,]^\top$ with $v_{j,T}\in\mathbb{R}^{j-1}$ or $\mathbb{R}^{j-2}$ $(j=n-r+1,\cdots,n)$. We collect the first j columns of $P_{G,F}$ and $X_{G,F}$ in $P_j=[\,p_1\ \cdots\ p_j\,]$ and $X_j=[\,x_1\ \cdots\ x_j\,]$, respectively.

3 Solving the RPA-PDSF via the generalized real Schur form

3.1 The parametric solution

Without loss of generality, assume that B *is of full column rank*. Let $B=Q[\,R^\top\ 0\,]^\top=Q_1R$ be the QR factorization of B, where $Q=[\,Q_1\ Q_2\,]\in\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ is orthogonal, $Q_1\in\mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$, and $R\in\mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$ is nonsingular and upper triangular. Substituting the QR factorization of B into (3) and (4), we deduce that

$$\begin{cases}F=R^{-1}Q_1^\top(X_{G,F}SP_{G,F}^\top-A),\\ G=R^{-1}Q_1^\top(X_{G,F}TP_{G,F}^\top-E),\end{cases}\quad(5)$$

where

$$\begin{cases} Q_2^\top (AP_{G,F} - X_{G,F}S) = 0, \\ Q_2^\top (EP_{G,F} - X_{G,F}T) = 0. \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

Consequently, once we obtain an orthogonal $P_{G,F}$, a nonsingular $X_{G,F}$ and a pair of upper quasi-triangular S and T satisfying (6), a solution (G, F) to the pole assignment problem can be computed through (5).

3.2 Assigning the infinite pole $(\alpha_j, 0)$

Provided that there exist some infinite poles in $\mathfrak{L}$, we shall show how to assign all infinite poles $(\alpha_j, 0)$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n-r$. Suppose $j-1$ infinite poles ($j \geq 1$) have already been placed, suggesting that P_{j-1}, $Q_2^\top X_{j-1}$ and the $(j-1)\times(j-1)$ leading principal submatrix S_{j-1} of S have been acquired. We are going to compute the j-th column of $P_{G,F}$, $Q_2^\top X_{G,F}$ and S when assigning the infinite pole $(\alpha_j, 0)$. We emphasize that $Q_2^\top X_{j-1}$ (not X_{j-1}) is known, in the computation of $Q_2^\top X_j$ (not X_j).

It is simple to show that $\operatorname{rank}([\,E\ B\,]) = m + \operatorname{rank}(Q_2^\top E)$, indicating that $l \triangleq \dim(\mathcal{N}(Q_2^\top E)) \geq n-r$. Let the columns of $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times l}$ be an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{N}(Q_2^\top E)$, and the second equation in (6) implies that $Q_2^\top E P_{n-r} = 0$. It follows that $P_{j-1} = ZW_{j-1}$ for some $W_{j-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{l\times(j-1)}$ with $W_{j-1}^\top W_{j-1} = I_{j-1}$ and $p_j = Zw_j$ with a normalized $w_j \in \mathbb{R}^l$ to be specified. From the j-th column of the first equation in (6), noting that the j-th diagonal element of S is 1 and P is orthogonal, we have

$$Q_2^\top AZw_j = Q_2^\top X_{j-1}v_{j,S} + Q_2^\top x_j, \quad W_{j-1}^\top w_j = 0.$$

Recalling the definition of $\Delta_F^2(A, E)$ in (2), we should solve the following optimization problem:

$$\min \quad \|v_{j,S}\|_2^2 \tag{7a}$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad M_{j-1}\begin{bmatrix} w_j^\top & x_j^\top & v_{j,S}^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top = 0, \tag{7b}$$

where

$$M_{j-1} = \begin{bmatrix} Q_2^\top AZ & -Q_2^\top & -Q_2^\top X_{j-1} \\ W_{j-1}^\top & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Theorem 5 in Section 3.6 demonstrates that M_{j-1} is of full row rank and there exists some vector $\begin{bmatrix} w^\top & x^\top & v_S^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top \in \mathcal{N}(M_{j-1})$ with $w \in \mathbb{R}^l$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $v_S \in \mathbb{R}^{j-1}$, such that $w \neq 0$. Denote $W_\perp \in \mathbb{R}^{l\times(l-j+1)}$ satisfying $W_{j-1}^\top W_\perp = 0$ and $W_\perp^\top W_\perp = I_{l-j+1}$, then the columns of

$$\begin{bmatrix} W_\perp & 0 & 0 \\ Q_2Q_2^\top AZW_\perp & -Q_2Q_2^\top X_{j-1} & Q_1 \\ 0 & I_{j-1} & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

form a basis of $\mathcal{N}(M_{j-1})$, suggesting $w_j = W_\perp u_j$ for some normalized $u_j \in \mathbb{R}^{l-j+1}$ and $x_j = Q_1 y_j + Q_2Q_2^\top AZw_j - Q_2(Q_2^\top X_{j-1})v_{j,S}$ for some $y_j \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Accordingly, $p_j = ZW_\perp u_j$, where u_j would take any arbitrary unit vector. Apparently, the optimization subproblem (7) obtains its minimum when $v_{j,S} = 0$, leading to $x_j = Q_1 y_j + Q_2Q_2^\top Ap_j$, with y_j to be specified in Section 3.5. Consequently, we obtain $Q_2^\top x_j = Q_2^\top Ap_j$ which is sufficient for the assigning process to continue. Note in the definition of M_{j-1} and the assigning procedure for finite poles later that only $Q_2^\top X_{j-1}$ (not X_{j-1}) is required.

The procedure for assigning all infinite poles is summarized in Algorithm 1, where we use $\Xi_{n-r} \equiv Q_2^\top X_{n-r}$.

Algorithm 1 Assigning all infinite poles $\{(\alpha_1, 0), \ldots, (\alpha_{n-r}, 0)\}$

Input:
A, E and Q_2.

Output:
Orthogonal $P_{n-r} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times(n-r)}$, upper triangular $S_{n-r} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-r)\times(n-r)}$ and $\Xi_{n-r} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-m)\times(n-r)}$.

1: Find $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times l}$, whose columns form an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{N}(Q_2^\top E)$.
2: Set $P_{n-r} = ZW_{n-r}$ with $W_{n-r} \in \mathbb{R}^{l\times(n-r)}$ an arbitrary orthogonal matrix.
3: Set $S_{n-r} = I_{n-r}$.
4: Set $\Xi_{n-r} = Q_2^\top AP_{n-r}$.

Provided that all infinite poles and some finite poles have already been assigned, where the complex conjugate poles are placed together. Consider the already acquired P_j, $Q_2^\top X_j$ and the $j\times j$ leading principal submatrix S_j and T_j of S and T, respectively, they satisfy

$$Q_2^\top AP_j = Q_2^\top X_j S_j, \quad Q_2^\top EP_j = Q_2^\top X_j T_j \quad (j \geq n-r).$$

The details of the pole assignment for the finite real pole $(\alpha_{j+1}, \beta_{j+1})$ and the finite complex conjugate poles $\{(\alpha_{j+1}, \beta_{j+1}), (\bar{\alpha}_{j+1}, \bar{\beta}_{j+1})\}$ will be presented in Sections 3.3 and 3.4, respectively. The $(j+1)$-th column, or the $(j+1)$-th and $(j+2)$-th columns, of $P_{G,F}$, $Q_2^\top X_{G,F}$, S and T are computed in the assignment process.

3.3 Assigning the finite real pole $(\alpha_{j+1}, \beta_{j+1})$

Let $(\alpha_{j+1}, \beta_{j+1}) \in \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}$, then the $(j+1)$-th diagonal elements of S and T are $\frac{\alpha_{j+1}}{\sqrt{|\alpha_{j+1}|^2+|\beta_{j+1}|^2}}$ and

$\frac{\beta_{j+1}}{\sqrt{|\alpha_{j+1}|^2+|\beta_{j+1}|^2}}$, respectively. The $(j+1)$-th columns in (6) are

$$\begin{cases} Q_2^\top A p_{j+1} - Q_2^\top X_j v_{j+1,S} - \dfrac{\alpha_{j+1} Q_2^\top x_{j+1}}{\sqrt{|\alpha_{j+1}|^2+|\beta_{j+1}|^2}} = 0, \\ Q_2^\top E p_{j+1} - Q_2^\top X_j v_{j+1,T} - \dfrac{\beta_{j+1} Q_2^\top x_{j+1}}{\sqrt{|\alpha_{j+1}|^2+|\beta_{j+1}|^2}} = 0, \end{cases}$$

which are the conditions p_{j+1}, x_{j+1}, $v_{j+1,S}$ and $v_{j+1,T}$ have to meet. From the definition of $\Delta_F^2(A,E)$ in (2) and the orthogonality of $P_{G,F}$, it is then natural to consider the optimization sub-problem:

$$\min_{\|p_{j+1}\|_2=1} \|v_{j+1,S}\|_2^2 + \|v_{j+1,T}\|_2^2 \tag{8a}$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad M_j \begin{bmatrix} p_{j+1}^\top & x_{j+1}^\top & v_{j+1,S}^\top & v_{j+1,T}^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top = 0, \tag{8b}$$

where

$$M_j = \begin{bmatrix} Q_2^\top A & -\frac{\alpha_{j+1} Q_2^\top}{\sqrt{|\alpha_{j+1}|^2+|\beta_{j+1}|^2}} & -Q_2^\top X_j & 0 \\ Q_2^\top E & -\frac{\beta_{j+1} Q_2^\top}{\sqrt{|\alpha_{j+1}|^2+|\beta_{j+1}|^2}} & 0 & -Q_2^\top X_j \\ P_j^\top & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{9}$$

Theorem 6 in Section 3.6 shows that $\dim(\mathcal{N}(M_j)) = 2m+j$ and there exists $\begin{bmatrix} p_{j+1}^\top & x_{j+1}^\top & v_{j+1,S}^\top & v_{j+1,T}^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top \in \mathcal{N}(M_j)$ such that $p_{j+1} \neq 0$, which guarantees the solvability of (8). Next, we shall consider the solution of the optimization sub-problem (8).

Case i ($|\alpha_{j+1}| \geq |\beta_{j+1}|$) Define

$$\widetilde{M}_j = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} -\frac{\alpha_{j+1} Q_2^\top}{\sqrt{|\alpha_{j+1}|^2+|\beta_{j+1}|^2}} & Q_2^\top A \ -Q_2^\top X_j \ 0 \\ \hline 0 & \widetilde{M}_{2,j} \end{array}\right]$$

with

$$\widetilde{M}_{2,j} = \begin{bmatrix} Q_2^\top \left(E - \frac{\beta_{j+1}}{\alpha_{j+1}} A\right) & \frac{\beta_{j+1}}{\alpha_{j+1}} Q_2^\top X_j & -Q_2^\top X_j \\ P_j^\top & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{10}$$

then (8b) is equivalent to $\widetilde{M}_j \begin{bmatrix} x_{j+1}^\top & p_{j+1}^\top & v_{j+1,S}^\top & v_{j+1,T}^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top = 0$. Equivalently, we have

$$\frac{\alpha_{j+1} Q_2^\top x_{j+1}}{\sqrt{|\alpha_{j+1}|^2+|\beta_{j+1}|^2}} = Q_2^\top A p_{j+1} - Q_2^\top X_j v_{j+1,S}$$

and $\widetilde{M}_{2,j} \begin{bmatrix} p_{j+1}^\top & v_{j+1,S}^\top & v_{j+1,T}^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top = 0$. Evidently, $\widetilde{M}_{2,j}$ is of full row rank, implying that $\dim(\mathcal{N}(\widetilde{M}_{2,j})) = m+j$. Let the columns of $\begin{bmatrix} Z_1^\top & Z_3^\top & Z_4^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top$ be an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{N}(\widetilde{M}_{2,j})$, where $Z_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times(m+j)}$, $Z_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{j\times(m+j)}$, $Z_4 \in \mathbb{R}^{j\times(m+j)}$, then the columns of

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & Q_1^\top & 0 & 0 \\ Z_1^\top & \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_{j+1}^2+\beta_{j+1}^2}}{\alpha_{j+1}} (A Z_1 - X_j Z_3)^\top Q_2 Q_2^\top & Z_3^\top & Z_4^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top$$

form a basis of $\mathcal{N}(M_j)$.

Consequently, the constrained optimization sub-problem (8) is reduced to the following quadratic optimization problem:

$$\min_{\|Z_1 u\|_2=1} u^\top (Z_3^\top Z_3 + Z_4^\top Z_4) u, \tag{11}$$

where $u \in \mathbb{R}^{m+j}$. Furthermore, since $Z_1^\top Z_1 + Z_3^\top Z_3 + Z_4^\top Z_4 = I_{m+j}$, (11) is further reduced to

$$\min_{\|Z_1 u\|_2=1} u^\top u, \tag{12}$$

which is attained by u being an eigenvector of $Z_1^\top Z_1$ corresponding to its greatest eigenvalue with $u^\top Z_1^\top Z_1 u = 1$. Once such u is obtained, p_{j+1}, $v_{j+1,S}$ and $v_{j+1,T}$ can be retrieved by

$$p_{j+1} = Z_1 u, \quad v_{j+1,S} = Z_3 u, \quad v_{j+1,T} = Z_4 u. \tag{13}$$

We also have

$$x_{j+1} = Q_1 y_{j+1} + \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_{j+1}^2+\beta_{j+1}^2}}{\alpha_{j+1}} Q_2 \left[Q_2^\top A p_{j+1} - (Q_2^\top X_j) v_{j+1,S}\right]$$

for some $y_{j+1} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ to be determined. Clearly,

$$Q_2^\top x_{j+1} = \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_{j+1}^2+\beta_{j+1}^2}}{\alpha_{j+1}} \left[Q_2^\top A p_{j+1} - (Q_2^\top X_j) v_{j+1,S}\right],$$

which can be computed and added to $Q_2^\top X_{j+1} = \begin{bmatrix} Q_2^\top X_j & Q_2^\top x_{j+1} \end{bmatrix}$. Recall from the definition of M_j in (9), it is $Q_2^\top X_{j+1}$, rather than X_{j+1}, that is required when assigning the finite real pole $(\alpha_{j+2}, \beta_{j+2})$, without requiring y_{j+1}. Similar comments hold for the case of $(\alpha_{j+2}, \beta_{j+2}) \in \mathbb{C}\times\mathbb{C}$, which will be discussed later. The choice of y_{j+1} will be discussed in Section 3.5.

Case ii ($|\alpha_{j+1}| < |\beta_{j+1}|$) Analogously to **Case i**, let the columns of $\begin{bmatrix} Z_1^\top & Z_3^\top & Z_4^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top$, where $Z_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times(m+j)}$,

$Z_3, Z_4 \in \mathbb{R}^{j\times(m+j)}$, form an orthonormal basis of

$$\widetilde{M}_{2,j} = \begin{bmatrix} Q_2^\top \left(A - \frac{\alpha_{j+1}}{\beta_{j+1}}E\right) & -Q_2^\top X_j & \frac{\alpha_{j+1}}{\beta_{j+1}}Q_2^\top X_j \\ P_j^\top & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{14}$$

where $\dim(\mathcal{R}([\, Z_1^\top \;\; Z_3^\top \;\; Z_4^\top \,]^\top)) = m + j$ is guaranteed by $\mathrm{rank}(\widetilde{M}_{2,j}) = (n - m + j)$. Besides, the columns of

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & Q_1^\top & 0 & 0 \\ Z_1^\top & \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_{j+1}^2+\beta_{j+1}^2}}{\beta_{j+1}}(EZ_1 - X_jZ_4)^\top Q_2 Q_2^\top & Z_3^\top & Z_4^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top$$

form a basis of $\mathcal{N}(M_j)$, leading to $p_{j+1} = Z_1u$, $v_{j+1,S} = Z_3u$, $v_{j+1,T} = Z_4u$ and

$$x_{j+1} = Q_1y_{j+1} + \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_{j+1}^2+\beta_{j+1}^2}}{\beta_{j+1}} Q_2 \left[Q_2^\top Ep_{j+1} - (Q_2^\top X_j)v_{j+1,T}\right],$$

for some $u \in \mathbb{R}^{m+j}$ and $y_{j+1} \in \mathbb{R}^m$. The constrained optimization sub-problem (8) can be solved in the same manner as in **Case i**, with y_{j+1} and x_{j+1} to be specified in Section 3.5.

Note 2 *When there is no infinite pole, i.e., $r = n$, some minor modifications to our method will be required. We first place the real finite pole (α_1, β_1). More specifically, there is no contribution from the first columns of S and T to $\Delta_F^2(A + BF, E + BG)$ and the optimization sub-problem* (8) *is degenerate. We just need to select p_1 and x_1 from the constraint* (8b)*. Lemma 4 in subsection 3.6 implies that M_0 is of full row rank, thus the feasibility of* (8b)*. We can select a normalized p_1, then $Q_2^\top x_1 = \alpha_1^{-1}\sqrt{\alpha_1^2+\beta_1^2}Q_2^\top Ap_1$ (for $|\alpha_1| \geq |\beta_1|$) or $Q_2^\top x_1 = \beta_1^{-1}\sqrt{\alpha_1^2+\beta_1^2}Q_2^\top Ep_1$ (for $|\alpha_1| < |\beta_1|$). In addition, we have $x_1 = Q_1y_1 + Q_2(Q_2^\top x_1)$ with y_1 to be chosen (as in Section 3.5). Similar comments hold when we have to assign a complex conjugate pair of finite poles first.*

We summarize the assignment of the finite real pole $(\alpha_{j+1}, \beta_{j+1})$ in Algorithm 2, with $\Xi_j \equiv Q_2^\top X_j$.

Algorithm 2 Assigning finite real pole $(\alpha_{j+1}, \beta_{j+1})$

Input:
A, E, Q_2, P_j, Ξ_j, S_j, T_j and $(\alpha_{j+1}, \beta_{j+1}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$.

Output:
Orthogonal $P_{j+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times(j+1)}$, upper quasi-triangular $S_{j+1}, T_{j+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{(j+1)\times(j+1)}$ and $\Xi_{j+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-m)\times(j+1)}$.

1: **if** $|\alpha_{j+1}| \geq |\beta_{j+1}|$ **then**
2: Find $\begin{bmatrix} Z_1^\top & Z_3^\top & Z_4^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top$ with $Z_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times(m+j)}$, $Z_3, Z_4 \in \mathbb{R}^{j\times(m+j)}$, whose columns form an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{N}(\widetilde{M}_{2,j})$ as defined in (10).
3: **else**
4: Find $\begin{bmatrix} Z_1^\top & Z_3^\top & Z_4^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top$ with $Z_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times(m+j)}$, $Z_3, Z_4 \in \mathbb{R}^{j\times(m+j)}$, whose columns form an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{N}(\widetilde{M}_{2,j})$ as defined in (14).
5: **end if**
6: Solve the optimization sub-problem (12) to get $u \in \mathbb{R}^{m+j}$.
7: Set $P_{j+1} = \begin{bmatrix} P_j & p_{j+1} \end{bmatrix}$ with $p_{j+1} = Z_1u$.
8: Set

$$S_{j+1} = \begin{bmatrix} S_j & v_{j+1,S} \\ & \frac{\alpha_{j+1}}{\sqrt{\alpha_{j+1}^2+\beta_{j+1}^2}} \end{bmatrix}, \quad T_{j+1} = \begin{bmatrix} T_j & v_{j+1,T} \\ & \frac{\beta_{j+1}}{\sqrt{\alpha_{j+1}^2+\beta_{j+1}^2}} \end{bmatrix}$$

with $v_{j+1,S} = Z_3u$ and $v_{j+1,T} = Z_4u$.
9: Set $\Xi_{j+1} = \begin{bmatrix} \Xi_j & \xi_{j+1} \end{bmatrix}$ with
$\xi_{j+1} = \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_{j+1}^2+\beta_{j+1}^2}}{\alpha_{j+1}}(Q_2^\top Ap_{j+1} - \Xi_j v_{j+1,S})$ (if $|\alpha_{j+1}| \geq |\beta_{j+1}|$),
$= \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_{j+1}^2+\beta_{j+1}^2}}{\beta_{j+1}}(Q_2^\top Ep_{j+1} - \Xi_j v_{j+1,T})$ (otherwise).

3.4 Assigning the finite complex pole $(\alpha_{j+1}, \beta_{j+1})$

With the 2×2 diagonal blocks in S and T specified in Lemma 1, assigning the complex conjugate pair $\{(\alpha_{j+1}, \beta_{j+1}), (\bar{\alpha}_{j+1}, \bar{\beta}_{j+1})\}$, involves two different cases, when $|\alpha_{j+1}| \geq |\beta_{j+1}|$ or otherwise.

3.4.1 Situation I

($|\alpha_{j+1}| \geq |\beta_{j+1}|$) Under such circumstance, we have $S(j+1:j+2, j+1:j+2) = I_2$ and $T(j+1:j+2, j+1:j+2) = D_{\delta_{j+1}}(\sigma_{j+1} + i\tau_{j+1})$. The $(j+1)$-th and $(j+2)$-th columns of (6) can be expanded to

$$\begin{aligned} &Q_2^\top A[\, p_{j+1} \;\; p_{j+2} \,] - Q_2^\top X_j[\, v_{j+1,S} \;\; v_{j+2,S} \,] - Q_2^\top[\, x_{j+1} \;\; x_{j+2} \,] = 0, \\ &Q_2^\top E[\, p_{j+1} \;\; p_{j+2} \,] - Q_2^\top X_j[\, v_{j+1,T} \;\; v_{j+2,T} \,] \\ &\qquad - Q_2^\top[\, x_{j+1} \;\; x_{j+2} \,] D_{\delta_{j+1}}(\sigma_{j+1} + i\tau_{j+1}) = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Let $\delta_{j+1} = \varsigma_1/\varsigma_2$ with $\varsigma_1, \varsigma_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varsigma_2 \neq 0$. We can verify that

$$\begin{aligned} &D_{\delta_{j+1}}(\sigma_{j+1} + i\tau_{j+1}) \\ =&\frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix} \varsigma_1 & \varsigma_2 \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ i & -i \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{j+1}+i\tau_{j+1} & \\ & \sigma_{j+1}-i\tau_{j+1} \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} 1 & -i \\ 1 & i \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} \varsigma_1^{-1} & \\ & \varsigma_2^{-1} \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Defining $\tilde{p}_{j+l} = \varsigma_l p_{j+l}$, $\tilde{x}_{j+l} = \varsigma_l x_{j+l}$, $\tilde{v}_{j+l,S} = \varsigma_l v_{j+l,S}$ and $\tilde{v}_{j+l,T} = \varsigma_l v_{j+l,T}$ for $l = 1, 2$, (15) is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} Q_2^\top A(\tilde{p}_{j+1} + i\tilde{p}_{j+2}) - Q_2^\top X_j(\tilde{v}_{j+1,S} + i\tilde{v}_{j+2,S}) \\ \qquad\qquad -Q_2^\top(\tilde{x}_{j+1} + i\tilde{x}_{j+2}) = 0, \\ Q_2^\top E(\tilde{p}_{j+1} + i\tilde{p}_{j+2}) - Q_2^\top X_j(\tilde{v}_{j+1,T} + i\tilde{v}_{j+2,T}) \\ \qquad\qquad -(\sigma_{j+1} + i\tau_{j+1})Q_2^\top(\tilde{x}_{j+1} + i\tilde{x}_{j+2}) = 0. \end{cases} \tag{16}$$

Consequently, $\tilde{p}_{j+l}$, $\tilde{x}_{j+l}$, $\tilde{v}_{j+l,S}$ and $\tilde{v}_{j+l,T}$ $(l = 1, 2)$ have to be selected satisfying (16), in addition to the constraint $[\,\tilde{p}_{j+1}\ \tilde{p}_{j+2}\,]^\top[\,\tilde{p}_{j+1}\ \tilde{p}_{j+2}\,] = \mathrm{diag}(\varsigma_1^2, \varsigma_2^2)$ (so that $[\,p_{j+1}\ p_{j+2}\,]^\top[\,p_{j+1}\ p_{j+2}\,] = I_2$).

Recalling the definition $\Delta_F^2(A, E)$ in (2), we then select $(j+1)$-th and $(j+2)$-th columns of $P_{G,F}$, $X_{G,F}$, S and T while minimizing their contributions to $\Delta_F^2(A+BF, E+BG)$. In other words, we solve the optimization sub-problem:

$$\min_{\substack{\varsigma_1,\varsigma_2,\\ \tilde{v}_{j+1,S},\tilde{v}_{j+2,S},\\ \tilde{v}_{j+1,T},\tilde{v}_{j+2,T}}} \sum_{l=1}^{2}\left[\frac{\|\tilde{v}_{j+l,S}\|_2^2}{\varsigma_l^2} + \frac{\|\tilde{v}_{j+l,T}\|_2^2}{\varsigma_l^2}\right] + \tau_{j+1}^2\left(\frac{\varsigma_1}{\varsigma_2} - \frac{\varsigma_2}{\varsigma_1}\right)^2 \tag{17a}$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad [\,\tilde{p}_{j+1}^\top + i\tilde{p}_{j+2}^\top,\ \ \tilde{x}_{j+1}^\top + i\tilde{x}_{j+2}^\top, \\ \tilde{v}_{j+1,S}^\top + i\tilde{v}_{j+2,S}^\top,\ \ \tilde{v}_{j+1,T}^\top + i\tilde{v}_{j+2,T}^\top\,]^\top \in \mathcal{N}(M_j), \tag{17b}$$

$$[\,\tilde{p}_{j+1}\ \tilde{p}_{j+2}\,]^\top[\,\tilde{p}_{j+1}\ \tilde{p}_{j+2}\,] = \mathrm{diag}(\varsigma_1^2, \varsigma_2^2), \tag{17c}$$

where

$$M_j = \begin{bmatrix} Q_2^\top A & -Q_2^\top & -Q_2^\top X_j & 0 \\ Q_2^\top E & -(\sigma_{j+1} + i\tau_{j+1})Q_2^\top & 0 & -Q_2^\top X_j \\ P_j^\top & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{18}$$

Once a solution to the optimization sub-problem (17) is acquired, then the $(j+1)$-th and $(j+2)$-th columns of $P_{G,F}$, $X_{G,F}$, S and T can be retrieved via normalization: (for $l = 1, 2$)

$$p_{j+l} = \frac{\tilde{p}_{j+l}}{\|\tilde{p}_{j+l}\|_2}, \qquad x_{j+l} = \frac{\tilde{x}_{j+l}}{\|\tilde{p}_{j+l}\|_2},$$
$$v_{j+l,S} = \frac{\tilde{v}_{j+l,S}}{\|\tilde{p}_{j+l}\|_2}, \qquad v_{j+l,T} = \frac{\tilde{v}_{j+l,T}}{\|\tilde{p}_{j+l}\|_2}.$$

To solve the constrained optimization sub-problem (17), we firstly consider the constraint (17b). Analogous to the previous section for finite real poles, define $\gamma_{j+1} \equiv \sigma_{j+1} + i\tau_{j+1}$,

$$\widetilde{M}_{2,j} = \begin{bmatrix} Q_2^\top(E - \gamma_{j+1}A) & \gamma_{j+1}Q_2^\top X_j & -Q_2^\top X_j \\ P_j^\top & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{19}$$

$$\widetilde{M}_j = \left[\begin{array}{c|cc} -Q_2^\top & Q_2^\top A & -Q_2^\top X_j\ 0 \\ \hline 0 & \multicolumn{2}{c}{\widetilde{M}_{2,j}} \end{array}\right],$$

then we have $M_j[\,z_1^\top\ z_2^\top\ z_3^\top\ z_4^\top\,]^\top = 0$ if and only if $\widetilde{M}_j[\,z_2^\top\ z_1^\top\ z_3^\top\ z_4^\top\,]^\top = 0$ with $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{C}^n$, $z_3, z_4 \in \mathbb{C}^j$. Furthermore, it follows from Theorem 6 in Section 3.6 that M_j, thus $\widetilde{M}_{2,j}$, are of full row rank, or $\dim(\mathcal{N}(\widetilde{M}_{2,j})) = m + j$. Now let the columns of $\begin{bmatrix} Z_1^\top & Z_3^\top & Z_4^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top$ be an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{N}(\widetilde{M}_{2,j})$, where $Z_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times(m+j)}$, $Z_3, Z_4 \in \mathbb{C}^{j\times(m+j)}$, then the columns of

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & Q_1^\top & 0 & 0 \\ Z_1^\top & (AZ_1 - X_jZ_3)^\top Q_2 Q_2^\top & Z_3^\top & Z_4^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top$$

constitute a basis of $\mathcal{N}(M_j)$. We can then select

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{p}_{j+1} + i\tilde{p}_{j+2} &= Z_1 b, \\ \tilde{x}_{j+1} + i\tilde{x}_{j+2} &= Q_1 y + Q_2 Q_2^\top(AZ_1 - X_jZ_3)b, \\ \tilde{v}_{j+1,S} + i\tilde{v}_{j+2,S} &= Z_3 b, \\ \tilde{v}_{j+1,T} + i\tilde{v}_{j+2,T} &= Z_4 b, \end{aligned}$$

for some $0 \neq b \in \mathbb{C}^{m+j}$ and $y \in \mathbb{C}^m$. Accordingly, the optimization problem (17) is reduced to choosing some suitable nonzero $b \in \mathbb{C}^{m+j}$ such that $\tilde{p}_{j+1}^\top \tilde{p}_{j+2} = 0$, while minimizing the objective function formulated in (17a). It is worthwhile to point out that Theorem 6 in Section 3.6 guarantees that $Z_1 \neq 0$ and there exist some nontrivial $b \in \mathbb{C}^{m+j}$ such that $\tilde{p}_{j+1}$ and $\tilde{p}_{j+2}$ are linearly independent, which is necessary for $\{\tilde{p}_{j+1}, \tilde{p}_{j+2}\}$ to be orthogonal. In what follows, we consider how $b \in \mathbb{C}^{m+j}$ is selected, in two distinct cases.

Denote $Z_1 = U_{Z_1}\Sigma_{Z_1}V_{Z_1}^*$ as the Singular Value Decomposition (SVD) of Z_1, where its nonzero singular values ν_j $(j = 1, \cdots, r_{Z_1})$ satisfy $\nu_1 \geq \nu_2 \geq \ldots \geq \nu_{r_{Z_1}} > 0$. Note that $Z_1^*Z_1 + Z_3^*Z_3 + Z_4^*Z_4 = I_{m+j}$, implying that $Z_3^*Z_3 + Z_4^*Z_4 = V_{Z_1}(I_{m+j} - \Sigma_{Z_1}^\top\Sigma_{Z_1})V_{Z_1}^*$.

Case i $(\mathrm{rank}(Z_1) = 1)$ In this case, there exists a unique nonzero singular value ν_1 for Z_1, with the corresponding left-singular vector ψ_1. Define

$$\mathcal{N}_1(\widetilde{M}_{2,j}) \equiv \{\begin{bmatrix} \psi_1^\top & z_3^\top & z_4^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top : \quad z_3 = Z_3 b, \quad z_4 = Z_4 b,$$
$$b = V_{Z_1}\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\nu_1} & \eta_2 & \cdots & \eta_{m+j-1} \end{bmatrix}^\top, \quad \eta_2, \ \ldots, \ \eta_{m+j-1} \in \mathbb{C}\},$$

then with proper scaling, one can show that $\mathcal{N}_1(\widetilde{M}_{2,j})$ is the unique subset of $\mathcal{N}(\widetilde{M}_{2,j})$, which contains $[\, z_1^\top \;\; z_3^\top \;\; z_4^\top \,]^\top$ with $0 \neq z_1 \in \mathbb{C}^n$, $z_3, z_4 \in \mathbb{C}^j$. Furthermore, it follows from Theorem 6 in Section 3.6 that $\mathrm{Re}(\psi_1)$ and $\mathrm{Im}(\psi_1)$ are linearly independent.

We then select $\tilde{p}_{j+1}$ and $\tilde{p}_{j+2}$ as the vectors generated by the Jacobi orthogonal transformation on $\mathrm{Re}(\psi_1)$ and $\mathrm{Im}(\psi_1)$:

$$[\, \tilde{p}_{j+1} \;\; \tilde{p}_{j+2} \,] = [\, \mathrm{Re}(\psi_1) \;\; \mathrm{Im}(\psi_1) \,] \left[\begin{smallmatrix} c & s \\ -s & c \end{smallmatrix}\right], \tag{20}$$

with c and s selected to enforce $\tilde{p}_{j+1}^\top \tilde{p}_{j+2} = 0$. Notice that $D_{\delta_{j+1}}(\sigma_{j+1} + i\tau_{j+1})$ is already determined with $\delta_{j+1} = \|\tilde{p}_{j+1}\|_2 / \|\tilde{p}_{j+2}\|_2$ (with $\varsigma_1 = \|\tilde{p}_{j+1}\|_2$, $\varsigma_2 = \|\tilde{p}_{j+2}\|_2$). Accordingly, $\tilde{v}_{j+1,S}$, $\tilde{v}_{j+2,S}$, $\tilde{v}_{j+1,T}$ and $\tilde{v}_{j+2,T}$ will be selected from

$$\begin{aligned} [\, \tilde{v}_{j+1,S} \;\; \tilde{v}_{j+2,S} \,] &= [\, \mathrm{Re}(Z_3 b) \;\; \mathrm{Im}(Z_3 b) \,] \left[\begin{smallmatrix} c & s \\ -s & c \end{smallmatrix}\right], \\ [\, \tilde{v}_{j+1,T} \;\; \tilde{v}_{j+2,T} \,] &= [\, \mathrm{Re}(Z_4 b) \;\; \mathrm{Im}(Z_4 b) \,] \left[\begin{smallmatrix} c & s \\ -s & c \end{smallmatrix}\right], \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

where $b = V_{Z_1} \left[\frac{1}{\nu_1} \;\; \eta_2 \;\; \cdots \;\; \eta_{m+j-1}\right]^\top$, with $\eta_2, \ldots, \eta_{m+j-1} \in \mathbb{C}$ to be determined. Our goal will then be to choose some appropriate η's to minimize the first term in (17a).

Define $[\, w \;\; W \,] \equiv [\, Z_3^\top \;\; Z_4^\top \,]^\top V_{Z_1}$ with $w \in \mathbb{C}^{2j}$, $W \in \mathbb{C}^{2j \times (m+j-1)}$, $K_1 \equiv [\, \mathrm{Re}(W) \;\; -\mathrm{Im}(W) \,]$, $K_2 \equiv [\, \mathrm{Im}(W) \;\; \mathrm{Re}(W) \,]$, and

$$g = \mathrm{Re}(g) + i\mathrm{Im}(g) \equiv [\, \eta_2 \;\; \cdots \;\; \eta_{m+j-1} \,]^\top,$$

then a simple manipulation shows that the first term in (17a) equals

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{l=1}^{2} \left[\frac{\|\tilde{v}_{j+l,S}\|_2^2}{\varsigma_l^2} + \frac{\|\tilde{v}_{j+l,T}\|_2^2}{\varsigma_l^2} \right] \\ &= \left\{ [\, \mathrm{Re}(g)^\top \;\; \mathrm{Im}(g)^\top \,] H + h^\top \right\} [\, \mathrm{Re}(g)^\top \;\; \mathrm{Im}(g)^\top \,]^\top + \zeta, \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} H = {} & \tfrac{1}{\|\tilde{p}_{j+1}\|_2^2} (cK_1 - sK_2)^\top (cK_1 - sK_2) \\ & + \tfrac{1}{\|\tilde{p}_{j+2}\|_2^2} (sK_1 + cK_2)^\top (sK_1 + cK_2), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} h = {} & \tfrac{2}{\nu_1} \left(\tfrac{c^2}{\|\tilde{p}_{j+1}\|_2^2} + \tfrac{s^2}{\|\tilde{p}_{j+2}\|_2^2} \right) K_1^\top \mathrm{Re}(w) \\ & + \tfrac{2}{\nu_1} \left(\tfrac{s^2}{\|\tilde{p}_{j+1}\|_2^2} + \tfrac{c^2}{\|\tilde{p}_{j+2}\|_2^2} \right) K_2^\top \mathrm{Im}(w) \\ & + \tfrac{2cs}{\nu_1} \left(\tfrac{1}{\|\tilde{p}_{j+2}\|_2^2} - \tfrac{1}{\|\tilde{p}_{j+1}\|_2^2} \right) (K_2^\top \mathrm{Re}(w) + K_1^\top \mathrm{Im}(w)), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta = {} & \left(\tfrac{c^2}{\|\tilde{p}_{j+1}\|_2^2} + \tfrac{s^2}{\|\tilde{p}_{j+2}\|_2^2} \right) \tfrac{\|\mathrm{Re}(w)\|_2^2}{\nu_1^2} \\ & + \left(\tfrac{s^2}{\|\tilde{p}_{j+1}\|_2^2} + \tfrac{c^2}{\|\tilde{p}_{j+2}\|_2^2} \right) \tfrac{\|\mathrm{Im}(w)\|_2^2}{\nu_1^2} \\ & + \tfrac{2cs}{\nu_1^2} \left(\tfrac{1}{\|\tilde{p}_{j+2}\|_2^2} - \tfrac{1}{\|\tilde{p}_{j+1}\|_2^2} \right) \mathrm{Re}(w)^\top \mathrm{Im}(w). \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, H is symmetric semipositive definite. In fact, H is symmetric positive definite. For if $Hf = 0$ with $f \in \mathbb{R}^{2m+2j-2}$, then $K_1 f = K_2 f = 0$ by the definition of H. On the other hand, it follows from the definitions of K_1, K_2 and W that $K_1^\top K_1 + K_2^\top K_2 = I_{2(m+j-1)}$. Hence $f = 0$, proving that H is nonsingular. Consequently, the minimizer of (22) is given by

$$[\, \mathrm{Re}(g)^\top \;\; \mathrm{Im}(g)^\top \,]^\top = -\frac{1}{2} H^{-1} h. \tag{23}$$

Once we obtain $g \in \mathbb{C}^{m+j-1}$, $\tilde{v}_{j+1,S}$, $\tilde{v}_{j+2,S}$, $\tilde{v}_{j+1,T}$ and $\tilde{v}_{j+2,T}$ can be computed via (21). Also, we observe that $b = (c + is) V_{Z_1} \left[\frac{1}{\nu_1} \;\; g^\top\right]^\top$ here, with c and s from the Jacobi orthogonal transformation on $[\mathrm{Re}(\psi_1), \mathrm{Im}(\psi_1)]$.

We still need to determine $\tilde{x}_{j+1}$ and $\tilde{x}_{j+2}$, where $\tilde{x}_{j+1} + i\tilde{x}_{j+2} = Q_1 y + Q_2 Q_2^\top A(\tilde{p}_{j+1} + i\tilde{p}_{j+2}) - Q_2(Q_2^\top X_j)(\tilde{v}_{j+1,S} + i\tilde{v}_{j+2,S})$ for some $y \in \mathbb{C}^m$, which is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} x_{j+1} &= \tfrac{1}{\|\tilde{p}_{j+1}\|_2} \left[Q_1 \mathrm{Re}(y) + Q_2 Q_2^\top A \tilde{p}_{j+1} - Q_2 (Q_2^\top X_j) \tilde{v}_{j+1,S} \right], \\ x_{j+2} &= \tfrac{1}{\|\tilde{p}_{j+2}\|_2} \left[Q_1 \mathrm{Im}(y) + Q_2 Q_2^\top A \tilde{p}_{j+2} - Q_2 (Q_2^\top X_j) \tilde{v}_{j+2,S} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $Q_2^\top x_{j+l} = Q_2^\top A p_{j+l} - (Q_2^\top X_j) v_{j+l,S}$ $(l = 1, 2)$. Again, as pointed out previously, only $Q_2^\top X_{j+2} = Q_2^\top [\, X_j \;\; x_{j+1} \;\; x_{j+2} \,]$ is required for the assigning procedure to continue. When computing x_{j+1} and x_{j+2}, we may rewrite $y_{j+1} = \mathrm{Re}(y)/\|\tilde{p}_{j+1}\|_2$ and $y_{j+2} = \mathrm{Im}(y)/\|\tilde{p}_{j+2}\|_2$, which will be selected in Section 3.5.

Case ii $(\mathrm{rank}(Z_1) \geq 2)$ In this case, we shall employ the strategy for placing complex conjugate pairs in [18]. It produces reasonably good suboptimal feasible points for (17). We shall sketch the placement process; for details, please consult [18].

We set

$$b = V_{Z_1} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} e_1 & e_2 \\ \nu_1 & \nu_2 \end{smallmatrix}\right] \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \gamma_1 + i\zeta_1 \\ \gamma_2 + i\zeta_2 \end{smallmatrix}\right],$$

where $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ are to be determined with $\gamma_1^2 + \gamma_2^2 + \zeta_1^2 + \zeta_2^2 = 1$, and let ψ_1 and ψ_2 denote the left singular vectors of Z_1 corresponding to its two largest singular values ν_1 and ν_2, respectively. It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{p}_{j+1} + i\tilde{p}_{j+2} &= \begin{bmatrix} \psi_1 & \psi_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_1 + i\zeta_1 \\ \gamma_2 + i\zeta_2 \end{bmatrix}, \\ \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{v}_{j+1,S} + i\tilde{v}_{j+2,S} \\ \tilde{v}_{j+1,T} + i\tilde{v}_{j+2,T} \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} w_1 & w_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_1 + i\zeta_1 \\ \gamma_2 + i\zeta_2 \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

where $w_l = \frac{1}{\nu_l}\begin{bmatrix} V_{Z_1}^\top Z_3^\top & V_{Z_1}^\top Z_4^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top e_l$ for $l = 1, 2$. In the case of $\mathrm{Re}(\psi_1)^\top \mathrm{Im}(\psi_1) = 0$ and $\|\mathrm{Re}(\psi_1)\|_2 = \|\mathrm{Im}(\psi_1)\|_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$, we simply take $\gamma_1 = 1, \zeta_1 = \gamma_2 = \zeta_2 = 0$, yielding $\tilde{p}_{j+1} = \mathrm{Re}(\psi_1)$ and $\tilde{p}_{j+2} = \mathrm{Im}(\psi_1)$. This actually gives the objective function in (17a) its minimum $2(1-\nu_1^2)/\nu_1^2$. In general, there are two simple possibilities. One is to apply the Jacobi orthogonal transformation on $[\mathrm{Re}(\psi_1), \mathrm{Im}(\psi_1)]$ to produce $[\tilde{p}_{j+1}, \tilde{p}_{j+2}]$. This postulates that $\mathrm{Re}(\psi_1)$ and $\mathrm{Im}(\psi_1)$ are linearly independent, and the value of the objective function in (17a) equals

$$\begin{aligned}\varrho_1 =& \frac{\|c\mathrm{Re}(w_1) - s\mathrm{Im}(w_1)\|_2^2}{\|\tilde{p}_{j+1}\|_2^2} + \frac{\|s\mathrm{Re}(w_1) + c\mathrm{Im}(w_1)\|_2^2}{\|\tilde{p}_{j+2}\|_2^2} \\ &+ \tau_{j+1}^2 \left(\frac{\|\tilde{p}_{j+1}\|_2}{\|\tilde{p}_{j+2}\|_2} - \frac{\|\tilde{p}_{j+2}\|_2}{\|\tilde{p}_{j+1}\|_2} \right)^2 \\ \le& \frac{1}{\min\{\|\tilde{p}_{j+1}\|_2^2,\ \|\tilde{p}_{j+2}\|_2^2\}} \left(\frac{1-\nu_1^2}{\nu_1^2} + \tau_{j+1}^2 \right).\end{aligned}$$

The other possibility makes use of the following spectral decomposition of the Hamiltonian matrix [18]:

$$\begin{aligned}&\begin{bmatrix} K_R^\top K_R - K_I^\top K_I & -(K_R^\top K_I + K_I^\top K_R) \\ -(K_R^\top K_I + K_I^\top K_R) & K_I^\top K_I - K_R^\top K_R \end{bmatrix} \\ &\qquad = \Omega\, \mathrm{diag}(\phi_1, \phi_2, -\phi_1, -\phi_2)\Omega^\top,\end{aligned}$$

with $K_R = [\,\mathrm{Re}(\psi_1)\ \mathrm{Re}(\psi_2)\,]$, $K_I = [\,\mathrm{Im}(\psi_1)\ \mathrm{Im}(\psi_2)\,]$, $\phi_1 \ge \phi_2 > 0$. Some $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \zeta_1, \zeta_2$ are chosen (essentially determined by ϕ_1, ϕ_2) such that $\tilde{p}_{j+1}^\top \tilde{p}_{j+2} = 0$ and $\|\tilde{p}_{j+1}\|_2 = \|\tilde{p}_{j+2}\|_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$. This eventually gives the objective function in (17a) the value

$$\varrho_2 = 2\sum_{l=1}^{2} \frac{1-\nu_l^2}{\nu_l^2}(\gamma_l^2 + \zeta_l^2) \le \frac{2(1-\nu_2^2)}{\nu_2^2}.$$

Then we take the possibility corresponding to the minimum of ϱ_1 and ϱ_2, choosing the $(j+1)$-th and $(j+2)$-th columns of $P_{G,F}$, S and T accordingly.

As in **Case i**, we also need to determine, for $l = 1, 2$:

$$\begin{aligned}x_{j+l} &= Q_1 y_{j+l} + Q_2 Q_2^\top A p_{j+l} - Q_2 (Q_2^\top X_j) v_{j+l,S}, \\ Q_2^\top x_{j+l} &= Q_2^\top A p_{j+l} - (Q_2^\top X_j) v_{j+l,S},\end{aligned}$$

for some $y_{j+l} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ to be determined in Section 3.5.

3.4.2 Situation II

($|\alpha_{j+1}| < |\beta_{j+1}|$) Contrasting *Situation I*, here we have $S(j+1:j+2, j+1:j+2) = D_{\delta_{j+1}}(\tilde{\sigma}_{j+1} + i\tilde{\tau}_{j+1})$ and $T(j+1:j+2, j+1:j+2) = I_2$. Similarly to (15), the $(j+1)$-th and $(j+2)$-th columns of $P_{G,F}$, $X_{G,F}$, S and T satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}&Q_2^\top A[\,p_{j+1}\ p_{j+2}\,] - Q_2^\top X_j[\,v_{j+1,S}\ v_{j+2,S}\,] \\ &\qquad -Q_2^\top[\,x_{j+1}\ x_{j+2}\,] D_{\delta_{j+1}}(\tilde{\sigma}_{j+1} + i\tilde{\tau}_{j+1}) = 0, \\ &Q_2^\top E[\,p_{j+1}\ p_{j+2}\,] - Q_2^\top X_j[\,v_{j+1,T}\ v_{j+2,T}\,] \\ &\qquad -Q_2^\top[\,x_{j+1}\ x_{j+2}\,] = 0.\end{aligned}$$

Similar to *Situation I*, after defining $\delta_{j+1} = \varsigma_1/\varsigma_2$ with $\varsigma_1, \varsigma_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varsigma_2 \ne 0$, we need to solve the constrained optimization sub-problem:

$$\begin{aligned}\min_{\substack{\varsigma_1,\varsigma_2,\\ \tilde{v}_{j+1,S},\tilde{v}_{j+2,S},\\ \tilde{v}_{j+1,T},\tilde{v}_{j+2,T}}} & \sum_{l=1}^{2} \left\{ \frac{\|\tilde{v}_{j+l,S}\|_2^2}{\varsigma_l^2} + \frac{\|\tilde{v}_{j+l,T}\|_2^2}{\varsigma_l^2} \right\} + \tilde{\tau}_{j+1}^2 \left(\frac{\varsigma_1}{\varsigma_2} - \frac{\varsigma_2}{\varsigma_1} \right)^2 \\ \text{s.t.}\quad & [\,\tilde{p}_{j+1}^\top + i\tilde{p}_{j+2}^\top,\ \ \tilde{x}_{j+1}^\top + i\tilde{x}_{j+2}^\top, \\ & \tilde{v}_{j+1,S}^\top + i\tilde{v}_{j+2,S}^\top,\ \ \tilde{v}_{j+1,T}^\top + i\tilde{v}_{j+2,T}^\top\,]^\top \in \mathcal{N}(M_j), \\ & [\,\tilde{p}_{j+1}\ \tilde{p}_{j+2}\,]^\top [\,\tilde{p}_{j+1}\ \tilde{p}_{j+2}\,] = \mathrm{diag}(\varsigma_1^2, \varsigma_2^2),\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where

$$M_j = \begin{bmatrix} Q_2^\top A & -(\tilde{\sigma}_{j+1} + i\tilde{\tau}_{j+1})Q_2^\top & -Q_2^\top X_j & 0 \\ Q_2^\top E & -Q_2^\top & 0 & -Q_2^\top X_j \\ P_j^\top & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The above optimization problem (25) can be treated similarly as the optimization problem (17), We skip the details here.

Note 3 *Analogously to last section when assigning the finite real poles, we need to pay some attention when $j = 0$. Suppose that no infinite poles exist and the first finite poles to be assigned are (α_1, β_1) and $(\bar{\alpha}_1, \bar{\beta}_1)$ with $\mathrm{Im}(\alpha_1)\mathrm{Im}(\beta_1) \ne 0$. It follows from the structure of S and T that we just need to compute the first two columns of $P_{G,F}$, $Q_2^\top X_{G,F}$ and the 2×2 leading principal submatrices of S and T.*

When $|\alpha_1| \ge |\beta_1|$ (and neglecting the complementary case), the first two columns $p_1, p_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ of $P_{G,F}$ and $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ of $X_{G,F}$ should be chosen to satisfy

$$\begin{cases} Q_2^\top A[\,p_1\ p_2\,] - Q_2^\top[\,x_1\ x_2\,] = 0, \\ Q_2^\top E[\,p_1\ p_2\,] - Q_2^\top[\,x_1\ x_2\,] D_{\delta_1}(\sigma_1 + i\tau_1) = 0, \\ [\,p_1\ p_2\,]^\top [\,p_1\ p_2\,] = I_2, \end{cases} \tag{26}$$

so that $(\delta_1 - \delta_1^{-1})^2 \tau_1^2$ is minimized. This is obviously achieved when $\delta_1 = 1$, where (26) is reduced to (17b) and (17c) with $j = 0$, $\tilde{v}_{j+l,S}, \tilde{v}_{j+l,T}$ vanished, $\tilde{p}_{j+l}, \tilde{x}_{j+l}$

replaced by p_l, x_l respectively, and $\varsigma_l = 1$ ($l = 1, 2$). Let the columns of $Z \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times m}$ be an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{N}(M)$, where $M \equiv Q_2^\top[E-(\sigma_1+i\tau_1)A]$ is of full row rank follows by Lemma 4 in Section 3.6. Then the columns of

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & Z \\ Q_1 & Q_2Q_2^\top AZ \end{bmatrix}$$

construct a basis of $\mathcal{N}(M_0)$. Furthermore, there exist $p \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$ with $\{\mathrm{Re}(p), \mathrm{Im}(p)\}$ being linearly independent such that $[\,p^\top\ x^\top\,]^\top \in \mathcal{N}(M_0)$. Obviously, $p_1 = [\,\mathrm{Re}(Z)\ -\mathrm{Im}(Z)\,][\,u_1^\top\ u_2^\top\,]^\top$, $p_2 = [\,\mathrm{Im}(Z)\ \mathrm{Re}(Z)\,][\,u_1^\top\ u_2^\top\,]^\top$ for some $u_1, u_2 \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Adopting the method in [18], where two Hamiltonian matrices would be constructed and their spectral decompositions lead to $p_1^\top p_2 = 0$ and $\|p_1\|_2 = \|p_2\|_2 = 1$. We also have $x_l = Q_1y_l + Q_2Q_2^\top Ap_l$ for some $y_l \in \mathbb{R}^m$ (from Section 3.5), leading to $Q_2^\top x_l = Q_2^\top Ap_l$ for $l = 1, 2$. This is sufficient for the process to continue.

We recapitulate the assigning process of the complex conjugate poles $\{(\alpha_{j+1}, \beta_{j+1}), (\bar{\alpha}_{j+1}, \bar{\beta}_{j+1})\}$ in Algorithm 3, where $\Xi_j \equiv Q_2^\top X_j$. Again, the suboptimal strategies in [18] for complex conjugate poles is employed.

3.5 Determining $X_{G,F}$

We have $X_{G,F} = Q_1Y + Q_2(Q_2^\top X_{G,F})$, where $Q_2^\top X_{G,F}$ has been computed and $Y = [\,y_1\ \cdots\ y_n\,] \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ is to be determined. This last gap is to be filled in this section.

Lemma 3 *The computed matrix $Q_2^\top X_{G,F}$ is of full row rank.*

PROOF. Since the descriptor system (E, A, B) is S-controllable, then $[\,E\ AN_\infty\ B\,]$ is of full row rank with $\mathcal{R}(N_\infty)$ being the null space of E. This consequently leads to $\mathrm{rank}([\,Q_2^\top E\ Q_2^\top AN_\infty\,]) = n-m$. It hence holds that $[\,Q_2^\top E\ Q_2^\top A\,]$ is of full row rank, which is equivalent to $[\,Q_2^\top EP_{G,F}\ Q_2^\top AP_{G,F}\,]$ of having full row rank. Also, it follows from $Q_2^\top AP_{G,F} = Q_2^\top X_{G,F}S$ and $Q_2^\top EP_{G,F} = Q_2^\top X_{G,F}T$ that $[\,Q_2^\top X_{G,F}T\ Q_2^\top X_{G,F}S\,]$ is of full row rank, yielding the same for $Q_2^\top X_{G,F}$.

Now rewrite

$$X_{G,F} = \begin{bmatrix} Q_1 & Q_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} Y \\ Q_2^\top X_{G,F} \end{bmatrix},$$

it is nonsingular with $Y^\top$ not deficient in the complementary subspace of $\mathcal{R}(X_{G,F}^\top Q_2)$. Furthermore, we wish $X_{G,F}$ to be as well conditioned as possible. Thus we should choose $Y^\top$ whose orthonormal columns span the complementary subspace of $\mathcal{R}(X_{G,F}^\top Q_2)$. From the QR factorization $X_{G,F}^\top Q_2 = Q_X[\,R_X^\top\ 0\,]^\top = Q_{1,X}R_X$ with $Q_X = [\,Q_{1,X}\ Q_{2,X}\,] \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ being orthogonal, $Q_{1,X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times(n-m)}$ and $R_X \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-m)\times(n-m)}$ being nonsingular upper triangular, we then select $Y = Q_{2,X}^\top$, leading to $X_{G,F} = Q_1Q_{2,X}^\top + Q_2(Q_2^\top X_{G,F})$.

3.6 Supporting Theorems

Lemma 4 *For any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, $Q_2^\top(\lambda E - A)$ is of full row rank.*

PROOF. Since $\begin{bmatrix} \lambda E - A & B \end{bmatrix}$ is of full row rank for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and

$$\begin{bmatrix} Q_1 & Q_2 \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} \lambda E - A & B \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} Q_1^\top(\lambda E - A) & R \\ Q_2^\top(\lambda E - A) & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

the result holds because R is nonsingular.

Theorem 5 *For an S-controllable descriptor system (E, A, B), assume j infinite poles ($0 \le j \le (n - r - 1)$) have already been assigned with $P_j = [\,p_1\ \cdots\ p_j\,] = ZW_j$ and $Q_2^\top X_j = Q_2^\top[\,x_1\ \cdots\ x_j\,]$ computed, where the orthonormal columns of $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times l}$ span $Q_2^\top E$, $l = n-\mathrm{rank}(Q_2^\top E)$ and $W_j \in \mathbb{R}^{l\times j}$ satisfies $W_j^\top W_j = I_j$. Define*

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} Q_2^\top AZ & -Q_2^\top & -Q_2^\top X_j \\ W_j^\top & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

then we have

(a) $\dim(\mathcal{N}(M)) = m + l$; and
(b) there exist a nonzero $w \in \mathbb{R}^l$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $v_S \in \mathbb{R}^j$ such that $[\,w^\top\ x^\top\ v_S^\top\,]^\top \in \mathcal{N}(M)$.

PROOF. We firstly consider *(a)*, which is equivalent to M possessing full row rank. Let $f \in \mathbb{R}^{n-m}$, $h \in \mathbb{R}^j$ be vectors satisfying $[\,f^\top\ h^\top\,]M = 0$, we have $f^\top Q_2^\top AZ + h^\top W_j^\top = 0$ and $f^\top Q_2^\top = 0$. Hence f and h vanish for Q_2 and W_j are of full column rank, implying the result.

For *(b)*, assume the contrary and we have $\mathrm{rank}(Q_2^\top) = \mathrm{rank}([\,Q_2^\top\ Q_2^\top X_j\,]) = (n-m) + (j-l)$, implying $j = l$. Since $l = n - \mathrm{rank}(Q_2^\top E)$ and $\mathrm{rank}([\,E\ B\,]) = m +$

Algorithm 3 Assigning complex conjugate poles $\{(\alpha_{j+1},\beta_{j+1}),(\bar{\alpha}_{j+1},\bar{\beta}_{j+1})\}$

Input:

A, E, Q_2, P_j, Ξ_j, S_j, T_j and $(\alpha_{j+1},\beta_{j+1}) \in \mathbb{C}\times\mathbb{C}$.

Output:

Orthogonal $P_{j+2} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times(j+2)}$, upper quasi-triangular $S_{j+2}, T_{j+2} \in \mathbb{R}^{(j+2)\times(j+2)}$ and $\Xi_{j+2} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-m)\times(j+2)}$.

if $|\alpha_{j+1}| \geq |\beta_{j+1}|$ **then**

  Compute σ_{j+1} and τ_{j+1} as defined in Lemma 1.

  Find $\begin{bmatrix} Z_1^\top & Z_3^\top & Z_4^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top$ with $Z_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times(m+j)}$, $Z_3, Z_4 \in \mathbb{C}^{j\times(m+j)}$, whose orthonormal columns span $\mathcal{N}(\widetilde{M}_{2,j})$ from (19).

else

  Compute $\tilde{\sigma}_{j+1}$ and $\tilde{\tau}_{j+1}$ as defined in Lemma 1.

  Find $\begin{bmatrix} Z_1^\top & Z_3^\top & Z_4^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top$ with $Z_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times(m+j)}$, $Z_3, Z_4 \in \mathbb{C}^{j\times(m+j)}$, whose orthonormal columns span the null space of

$$\widetilde{M}_{2,j} = \begin{bmatrix} Q_2^\top(A-(\tilde{\sigma}_{j+1}+i\tilde{\tau}_{j+1})E) & -\Xi_j & (\tilde{\sigma}_{j+1}+i\tilde{\tau}_{j+1})\Xi_j \\ P_j^\top & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

end if

if $\operatorname{rank}(Z_1) = 1$ **then**

  Perform the Jacobi orthogonal transformation on ψ_1 as in (20) to compute $\tilde{p}_{j+1}$ and $\tilde{p}_{j+2}$, where ψ_1 is the left singular vector of Z_1 corresponding to its unique nonzero singular value ν_1.

  Compute $\tilde{v}_{j+1,S}$, $\tilde{v}_{j+2,S}$, $\tilde{v}_{j+1,T}$ and $\tilde{v}_{j+2,T}$ by (21), with $b = V_{Z_1}\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\nu_1} & g^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top$, the SVD $Z_1 = U_{Z_1}\Sigma_{Z_1}V_{Z_1}$ and g from (23).

else

  Solve the optimization problem (17) with the constraint (17b) replaced by

$$\widetilde{M}_{2,j}\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{p}_{j+1}^\top + i\tilde{p}_{j+2}^\top & \tilde{v}_{j+1,S}^\top + i\tilde{v}_{j+2,S}^\top & \tilde{v}_{j+1,T}^\top + i\tilde{v}_{j+2,T}^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top = 0,$$

  employing the suboptimal strategies in [18] to compute $\tilde{p}_{j+1}$, $\tilde{p}_{j+2}$, $\tilde{v}_{j+1,S}$, $\tilde{v}_{j+2,S}$, $\tilde{v}_{j+1,T}$ and $\tilde{v}_{j+2,T}$.

end if

Set $\delta_{j+1} = \frac{\|\tilde{p}_{j+1}\|_2}{\|\tilde{p}_{j+2}\|_2}$.

Set $P_{j+2} = \begin{bmatrix} P_j & p_{j+1} & p_{j+2} \end{bmatrix}$ with p_{j+1} and p_{j+1} being the normalized vectors of $\tilde{p}_{j+1}$ and $\tilde{p}_{j+2}$, respectively.

Set $v_{j+1,S}$, $v_{j+2,S}$, $v_{j+1,T}$, $v_{j+2,T}$ be the normalized vectors of $\tilde{v}_{j+1,S}$, $\tilde{v}_{j+2,S}$, $\tilde{v}_{j+1,T}$, $\tilde{v}_{j+2,T}$, respectively.

if $|\alpha_{j+1}| \geq |\beta_{j+1}|$ **then**

  Set

$$S_{j+2} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} S_j & \begin{matrix} v_{j+1,S} & v_{j+2,S} \end{matrix} \\ \hline & \begin{matrix} I_2 \end{matrix} \end{array}\right], \quad T_{j+2} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} T_j & \begin{matrix} v_{j+1,T} & v_{j+2,T} \end{matrix} \\ \hline & \begin{matrix} D_{\delta_{j+1}(\sigma_{j+1}+i\tau_{j+1})} \end{matrix} \end{array}\right].$$

  Set $\Xi_{j+2} = \begin{bmatrix} \Xi_j & \xi_{j+1} & \xi_{j+2} \end{bmatrix}$ with $\xi_{j+1} = Q_2^\top A p_{j+1} - \Xi_j v_{j+1,S}$ and $\xi_{j+2} = Q_2^\top A p_{j+2} - \Xi_j v_{j+2,S}$.

else

  Set

$$S_{j+2} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} S_j & \begin{matrix} v_{j+1,S} & v_{j+2,S} \end{matrix} \\ \hline & \begin{matrix} D_{\delta_{j+1}(\tilde{\sigma}_{j+1}+i\tilde{\tau}_{j+1})} \end{matrix} \end{array}\right], \quad T_{j+2} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} T_j & \begin{matrix} v_{j+1,T} & v_{j+2,T} \end{matrix} \\ \hline & \begin{matrix} I_2 \end{matrix} \end{array}\right].$$

  Set $\Xi_{j+2} = \begin{bmatrix} \Xi_j & \xi_{j+1} & \xi_{j+2} \end{bmatrix}$ with $\xi_{j+1} = Q_2^\top E p_{j+1} - \Xi_j v_{j+1,T}$ and $\xi_{j+2} = Q_2^\top E p_{j+2} - \Xi_j v_{j+2,T}$.

end if

$\mathrm{rank}(Q_2^\top E)$, then $l = j = n - (\mathrm{rank}([\,E\ B\,]) - m) \geq n - r$ since $\mathrm{rank}([\,E\ B\,]) - m \leq r$. On the other hand, $j \leq n - r - 1$ since there exists at least one infinite pole that is not placed. Thus we get a contradiction and *(b)* holds.

Theorem 6 *For an S-controllable descriptor system (E, A, B), assume all infinite poles*

$$\{(\alpha_1, \beta_1), \ldots, (\alpha_{n-r}, \beta_{n-r})\}$$

and j finite poles

$$\{(\alpha_{n-r+1}, \beta_{n-r+1}), \ldots, (\alpha_{n-r+j}, \beta_{n-r+j})\} \subseteq \mathfrak{L}$$

have already been assigned as described in Section 3, where $j < r$ if there is at least one unassigned finite real pole, or $(j+1) < r$ when there is at least a pair of unassigned complex conjugate poles. Let $P_{n-r+j} = [\,p_1 \cdots p_{n-r+j}\,]$ contain the first $n-r+j$ columns of $P_{G,F}$, S_{n-r+j} and T_{n-r+j} be the $(n-r+j) \times (n-r+j)$ principal submatrices of S and T, respectively, and $Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j} = Q_2^\top [\,x_1 \cdots x_{n-r+j}\,]$, all computed in the assigning process. Thus we have

$$\begin{cases} Q_2^\top A P_{n-r+j} = Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j} S_{n-r+j}, \\ Q_2^\top E P_{n-r+j} = Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j} T_{n-r+j}. \end{cases} \tag{27}$$

Assume that $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathfrak{L}$ is the finite real pole or $\{(\alpha, \beta), (\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta})\} \subseteq \mathfrak{L}$ are the complex conjugate poles to be assigned. Denote

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} Q_2^\top A & -\epsilon_1 Q_2^\top & -Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j} & 0 \\ Q_2^\top E & -\epsilon_2 Q_2^\top & 0 & -Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j} \\ P_{n-r+j}^\top & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where (i) $\epsilon_1 = \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{|\alpha|^2+|\beta|^2}}$, $\epsilon_2 = \frac{\beta}{\sqrt{|\alpha|^2+|\beta|^2}}$ for $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$; (ii) $\epsilon_1 = 1$ and $\epsilon_2 = \sigma + i\tau$ for $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}$ and $|\alpha| \geq |\beta|$, with $\sigma = \frac{\mathrm{Re}(\bar{\alpha}\beta)}{|\alpha|^2}$, $\tau = \frac{\mathrm{Im}(\bar{\alpha}\beta)}{|\alpha|^2}$; or (iii) $\epsilon_1 = \tilde{\sigma} + i\tilde{\tau}$, $\epsilon_2 = 1$ for $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}$ and $|\alpha| < |\beta|$, with $\sigma = \frac{\mathrm{Re}(\bar{\beta}\alpha)}{|\beta|^2}$ and $\tau = \frac{\mathrm{Im}(\bar{\beta}\alpha)}{|\beta|^2}$. Let the columns of

$$Z = \begin{bmatrix} Z_1 \\ Z_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{matrix} n \\ n+2(n-r+j) \end{matrix}$$

be an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{N}(M)$, then we have:

(a) $\dim(\mathcal{R}(Z)) = 2m + (n-r+j)$;
(b) $Z_1 \neq 0$; *and*
(c) for $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}$, there exist $0 \neq p = \mathrm{Re}(p) + i\mathrm{Im}(p) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ with $\{\mathrm{Re}(p), \mathrm{Im}(p)\}$ being linearly independent, $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$, $v_S \in \mathbb{C}^{n-r+j}$ and $v_T \in \mathbb{C}^{n-r+j}$ such that $[\,p^\top\ x^\top\ v_S^\top\ v_T^\top\,]^\top \in \mathcal{R}(Z)$.

PROOF. Obviously, $\dim(\mathcal{R}(Z)) = 2m + (n-r+j)$ if and only if M has full row rank. Suppose $z \in \mathbb{C}^{n-m}$, $y \in \mathbb{C}^{n-m}$ and $w \in \mathbb{C}^{n-r+j}$ satisfy $[\,z^\top\ y^\top\ w^\top\,]M = 0$, which is equivalent to

$$z^\top Q_2^\top A + y^\top Q_2^\top E + w^\top P_{n-r+j}^\top = 0, \tag{28a}$$
$$\epsilon_1 z^\top Q_2^\top + \epsilon_2 y^\top Q_2^\top = 0, \tag{28b}$$
$$z^\top Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j} = y^\top Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j} = 0. \tag{28c}$$

Post-multiplying P_{n-r+j} on both sides of (28a) gives $z^\top Q_2^\top A P_{n-r+j} + y^\top Q_2^\top E P_{n-r+j} + w^\top = 0$. Together with (27) and (28c), we get

$$z^\top Q_2^\top A P_{n-r+j} = z^\top Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j} S_{n-r+j} = 0,$$
$$y^\top Q_2^\top E P_{n-r+j} = y^\top Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j} T_{n-r+j} = 0,$$

leading to $w = 0$. Thus $z^\top Q_2^\top A + y^\top Q_2^\top E = z^\top (Q_2^\top A - \frac{\epsilon_1}{\epsilon_2} Q_2^\top E) = 0$ follows from (28a) and $\epsilon_2 \neq 0$ for all three cases. Furthermore from Lemma 4, $Q_2^\top (A - \frac{\epsilon_1}{\epsilon_2} E)$ is of full row rank, implying that $y = z = 0$. So M is of full row rank, hence *(a)* holds.

To prove *(b)*, we assume the contrary that $Z_1 = 0$. Then we have

$$\mathrm{rank}\left(\begin{bmatrix} -\epsilon_1 Q_2^\top & -Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j} & 0 \\ -\epsilon_2 Q_2^\top & 0 & -Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j} \end{bmatrix}\right) = (n-m) + (n-r+j-m).$$

Since Q_2 is of full column rank and

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & -Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j} & \frac{\epsilon_1}{\epsilon_2} Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j} \\ -\epsilon_2 Q_2^\top & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$
$$= \begin{bmatrix} I_{n-m} & -\frac{\epsilon_1}{\epsilon_2} I_{n-m} \\ & I_{n-m} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} -\epsilon_1 Q_2^\top & -Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j} & 0 \\ -\epsilon_2 Q_2^\top & 0 & -Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j} \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} I_n & 0 & -\frac{1}{\epsilon_2} X_{n-r+j} \\ & I_{n-r+j} & 0 \\ & & I_{n-r+j} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{29}$$

we deduce that $\mathrm{rank}([\,-Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j}\ \frac{\epsilon_1}{\epsilon_2} Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j}\,]) = \mathrm{rank}(Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j}) = (n-r+j) - m$, thus requiring $(n-r+j) \geq m$. When $(n-r+j) < m$, we have $Z_1 \neq 0$ and we need to consider the complementary case when $(n-r+j) \geq m$. Assume

that $Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j} H = 0$ with $H \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-r+j)\times m}$ and $H^\top H = I_m$, then $[\, H \;\; X_{n-r+j}^\top Q_2 \,]^\top$ is of full column rank. Define $Y_{n-r+j} = Q[\, H \;\; X_{n-r+j}^\top Q_2 \,]^\top$, we have $Q_2^\top Y_{n-r+j} = Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j}$. From (27), there exist $W_A, W_E \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times(n-r+j)}$ such that

$$\begin{cases} AP_{n-r+j} = Y_{n-r+j} S_{n-r+j} + BW_A, \\ EP_{n-r+j} = Y_{n-r+j} T_{n-r+j} + BW_E. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, it follows from

$$Y_{n-r+j} H = Q[\, H \;\; X_{n-r+j}^\top Q_2 \,]^\top H = Q_1 = BR^{-1}$$

that $B = Y_{n-r+j} HR$. Consequently, it holds that

$$\begin{cases} AP_{n-r+j} = Y_{n-r+j}(S_{n-r+j} + HRW_A), \\ EP_{n-r+j} = Y_{n-r+j}(T_{n-r+j} + HRW_E). \end{cases} \tag{30}$$

Define $K \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times(r-j)}$ satisfying $K^\top Y_{n-r+j} = 0$ and $K^\top K = I_{r-j}$, then pre-multiplying

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} (Y_{n-r+j}^\top Y_{n-r+j})^{-1} & \\ & I_{r-j} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} Y_{n-r+j}^\top \\ K^\top \end{bmatrix}$$

on both sides of (30) yields

$$\begin{aligned} LAP_{n-r+j} &= \begin{bmatrix} S_{n-r+j} + HRW_A \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \\ LEP_{n-r+j} &= \begin{bmatrix} T_{n-r+j} + HRW_E \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $P_\perp \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times(r-j)}$ satisfying $P_\perp^\top P_{n-r+j} = 0$ and $P_\perp^\top P_\perp = I_{r-j}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} LA \begin{bmatrix} P_{n-r+j} & P_\perp \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} S_{n-r+j} + HRW_A & A_{12} \\ 0 & A_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \\ LE \begin{bmatrix} P_{n-r+j} & P_\perp \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} T_{n-r+j} + HRW_E & E_{12} \\ 0 & E_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

where $[\, A_{12}^\top \;\; A_{22}^\top \,]^\top = LAP_\perp$ and $[\, E_{12}^\top \;\; E_{22}^\top \,]^\top = LEP_\perp$. Since $LB = [\, R^\top H^\top \;\; 0 \,]^\top$, then for the system $(LE[\, P_{n-r+j} \;\; P_\perp \,], \;\; LA[\, P_{n-r+j} \;\; P_\perp \,], \;\; LB)$ (which is equivalent to the descriptor system (E, A, B)), there are at most j finite poles assignable with the PD-SF. Such result obviously contradicts with Lemma 2 since $j < r$, hence *(b)* holds.

Regarding *(c)*, we just give the proof when $\epsilon_1 = 1$ and $\epsilon_2 = \sigma + i\tau$. (When $\epsilon_1 = \tilde{\sigma} + i\tilde{\tau}$ and $\epsilon_2 = 1$, the proof is similar and ignored.)

If

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{rank} \left(\begin{bmatrix} -\epsilon_1 Q_2^\top & -Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j} & 0 \\ -\epsilon_2 Q_2^\top & 0 & -Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j} \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ \geq (n-m) + (n-r+j-m) + 2, \end{aligned}$$

then there exist

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{p}_1^\top & \tilde{x}_1^\top & \tilde{v}_{1,S}^\top & \tilde{v}_{1,T}^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top, \quad \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{p}_2^\top & \tilde{x}_2^\top & \tilde{v}_{2,S}^\top & \tilde{v}_{2,T}^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top \in \mathcal{R}(Z),$$

where $\tilde{p}_1, \tilde{p}_2 \in \mathbb{C}^n$, $\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_2 \in \mathbb{C}^n$, $\tilde{v}_{1,S}, \tilde{v}_{2,S} \in \mathbb{C}^{n-r+j}$ and $\tilde{v}_{1,T}, \tilde{v}_{2,T} \in \mathbb{C}^{n-r+j}$, such that $\tilde{p}_1$ and $\tilde{p}_2$ are linearly independent. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} p^\top & x^\top & v_S^\top & v_T^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top = (\xi_1 + i\eta_1) \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{p}_1^\top & \tilde{x}_1^\top & \tilde{v}_{1,S}^\top & \tilde{v}_{1,T}^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top \\ + (\xi_2 + i\eta_2) \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{p}_2^\top & \tilde{x}_2^\top & \tilde{v}_{2,S}^\top & \tilde{v}_{2,T}^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top, \end{aligned}$$

then we can always find suitable $\xi_1, \xi_2, \eta_1, \eta_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the real and the imaginary parts of the resulting $p \in \mathbb{C}^n$ are linearly independent.

While

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{rank} \left(\begin{bmatrix} -\epsilon_1 Q_2^\top & -Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j} & 0 \\ -\epsilon_2 Q_2^\top & 0 & -Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j} \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ = (n-m) + (n-r+j-m) + 1, \end{aligned}$$

it follows from (29) that

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{rank}(Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j}) &= \operatorname{rank}([\, -Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j} \;\; \tfrac{\epsilon_1}{\epsilon_2} Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j} \,]) \\ &= (n-r+j) - (m-1). \end{aligned}$$

Thus it is necessary that $(n-r+j) \geq (m-1)$, which we assume from now on. If *(c)* does not hold, then there exist vectors $0 \neq p \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\operatorname{Re}(x) + i\operatorname{Im}(x) = x \in \mathbb{C}^n$, $\operatorname{Re}(v_S) + i\operatorname{Im}(v_S) = v_S \in \mathbb{C}^{n-r+j}$, $\operatorname{Re}(v_T) + i\operatorname{Im}(v_T) = v_T \in \mathbb{C}^{n-r+j}$ such that $[\, p^\top \;\; x^\top \;\; v_S^\top \;\; v_T^\top \,]^\top \in \mathcal{N}(M)$, which is equivalent to

$$Q_2^\top Ap = Q_2^\top \operatorname{Re}(x) + Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j} \operatorname{Re}(v_S), \tag{32a}$$

$$Q_2^\top Ep = Q_2^\top (\sigma \operatorname{Re}(x) - \tau \operatorname{Im}(x)) + Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j} \operatorname{Re}(v_T), \tag{32b}$$

$$Q_2^\top \operatorname{Im}(x) = -Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j} \operatorname{Im}(v_S), \tag{32c}$$

$$Q_2^\top (\sigma \operatorname{Im}(x) + \tau \operatorname{Re}(x)) + Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j} \operatorname{Im}(v_T) = 0. \tag{32d}$$

From (32b) and (32c), we have $Q_2^\top Ep = \sigma Q_2^\top \mathrm{Re}(x) + Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j}[\tau \mathrm{Im}(v_S) + \mathrm{Re}(v_T)]$; and from (32c) and (32d), we get $Q_2^\top \mathrm{Re}(x) = Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j}[\frac{\sigma}{\tau}\mathrm{Im}(v_S) - \frac{1}{\tau}\mathrm{Im}(v_T)]$. Consquently, writing $\widehat{Q}^\top \equiv \left[Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j}\ Q_2^\top \mathrm{Re}(x)\right]$, we obtain

$$\begin{cases} Q_2^\top A\left[P_{n-r+j}\ p\right] = \widehat{Q}^\top \left[\begin{array}{c|c} S_{n-r+j} & \mathrm{Re}(v_S) \\ \hline & 1 \end{array}\right], \\ Q_2^\top E\left[P_{n-r+j}\ p\right] = \widehat{Q}^\top \left[\begin{array}{c|c} T_{n-r+j} & \tau\mathrm{Im}(v_S)+\mathrm{Re}(v_T) \\ \hline & \sigma \end{array}\right], \end{cases} \tag{33}$$

and $\mathrm{rank}(\widehat{Q}^\top) = \mathrm{rank}(Q_2^\top X_{n-r+j}) = (n-r+j) - m + 1$. Now let $H \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-r+j+1)\times m}$ satisfy $\widehat{Q}^\top H = 0$ and $H^\top H = I_m$. Define

$$Y_{n-r+j+1} = Q \begin{bmatrix} H^\top \\ \widehat{Q}^\top \end{bmatrix},$$

which is of full column rank, and let $K \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times(r-j-1)}$ be the matrix satisfying $K^\top Y_{n-r+j+1} = 0$ and $K^\top K = I_{r-j-1}$. Then it follows from (33) and $Q_2^\top Y_{n-r+j+1} = \widehat{Q}^\top$ that there exist $L_A \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times(n-r+j+1)}$, $L_E \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times(n-r+j+1)}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} A[\,P_{n-r+j}\ p\,] &= Y_{n-r+j+1}\left[\begin{array}{c|c} S_{n-r+j} & \mathrm{Re}(v_S) \\ \hline & 1 \end{array}\right] + BL_A, \\ E[\,P_{n-r+j}\ p\,] &= Y_{n-r+j+1}\left[\begin{array}{c|c} T_{n-r+j} & \tau\mathrm{Im}(v_S)+\mathrm{Re}(v_T) \\ \hline & \sigma \end{array}\right] \\ &\qquad + BL_E. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, it is easy to verify that $B = Y_{n-r+j+1}HR$. Now let $P_\perp \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times(r-j-1)}$ satisfy $P_\perp^\top[\,P_{n-r+j}\ p\,] = 0$ and $P_\perp^\top P_\perp = I_{r-j-1}$. Denoting

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= \left[\begin{array}{c|c} S_{n-r+j} & \mathrm{Re}(v_S) \\ \hline & 1 \end{array}\right] + HRL_A, \\ E_1 &= \left[\begin{array}{c|c} T_{n-r+j} & \tau\mathrm{Im}(v_S)+\mathrm{Re}(v_T) \\ \hline & \sigma \end{array}\right] + HRL_E, \end{aligned}$$

and writing

$$Y_{n-r+j+1}^\dagger = (Y_{n-r+j+1}^\top Y_{n-r+j+1})^{-1} Y_{n-r+j+1}^\top,$$

then simple manipulations show that

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} Y_{n-r+j+1}^\dagger \\ K^\top \end{bmatrix} A \left[P_{n-r+j}\ p \,\middle|\, P_\perp\right] &= \left[\begin{array}{c|c} A_1 & A_{12} \\ \hline & A_2 \end{array}\right], \\ \begin{bmatrix} Y_{n-r+j+1}^\dagger \\ K^\top \end{bmatrix} E \left[P_{n-r+j}\ p \,\middle|\, P_\perp\right] &= \left[\begin{array}{c|c} E_1 & E_{12} \\ \hline & E_2 \end{array}\right], \\ \begin{bmatrix} Y_{n-r+j+1}^\dagger \\ K^\top \end{bmatrix} B &= \begin{bmatrix} HR \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_{12} &= Y_{n-r+j+1}^\dagger AP_\perp, \quad A_2 = K^\top AP_\perp, \\ E_{12} &= Y_{n-r+j+1}^\dagger EP_\perp, \quad E_2 = K^\top EP_\perp. \end{aligned}$$

Apparently, for the descriptor system

$$\left(\left[\begin{array}{c|c} E_1 & E_{12} \\ \hline & E_2 \end{array}\right], \left[\begin{array}{c|c} A_1 & A_{12} \\ \hline & A_2 \end{array}\right], \begin{bmatrix} HR \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}\right),$$

which is equivalent to (E, A, B), there are at most $(j+1)$ finite poles assignable. This contradicts the fact that at least $(j+2)$ finite poles are assignable, hence *(c)* holds.

3.7 Algorithm

The framework of our algorithm, referred to as "`DRSchurS`", is given in this section. We assume that all infinite poles appear together in $\mathfrak{L}$, while complex conjugate poles appear in pairs. The `DRSchurS` algorithm below firstly assigns all infinite poles, then the finite ones.

4 Numerical examples

In this section, we illustrate the performance of our method `DRSchurS` by applying it to several examples, some from various references and others generated randomly.

Similar to the definition of the precision of the assigned poles in [18], we define

$$precs = \max_{n-r+1\le j\le n}\left(\log\left|\frac{\lambda_j - \hat{\lambda}_j}{\lambda_j}\right|\right)$$

to characterize the precision of the assigned finite poles, where $\lambda_j = \alpha_j/\beta_j$ are the chosen finite poles and $\hat{\lambda}_j$ are the computed ones from $(A+BF, E+BG)$. Implicitly, we expect the number of computed finite eigenvalues to

Algorithm 4 Framework of our `DRSchurS` algorithm.

Input:
$A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}, E \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$ and $\mathfrak{L} = \{(\alpha_1,0),\ldots,(\alpha_{n-r},0),(\alpha_{n-r+1},\beta_{n-r+1}),\ldots,(\alpha_n,\beta_n)\}$.
Output:
The feedback matrix $F \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ and $G \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$.
1: Compute the QR factorization:
$$B = Q\begin{bmatrix} R^\top & 0\end{bmatrix}^\top = \begin{bmatrix} Q_1 & Q_2\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} R^\top & 0\end{bmatrix}^\top = Q_1 R.$$
2: Compute $P_{n-r} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times(n-r)}$, $S_{n-r} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-r)\times(n-r)}$ and $\Xi_{n-r} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-m)\times(n-r)}$ by Algorithm 1; set $j = n-r$.
3: **while** $j < n$ **do**
4: **if** $(\alpha_{j+1},\beta_{j+1}) \in \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}$ **then**
5: Compute $P_{j+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times(j+1)}$, $S_{j+1}, T_{j+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{(j+1)\times(j+1)}$ and $\Xi_{j+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-m)\times(j+1)}$ by Algorithm 2; set $j = j+1$.
6: **else**
7: $P_{j+2} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times(j+2)}$, $S_{j+2}, T_{j+2} \in \mathbb{R}^{(j+2)\times(j+2)}$ and $\Xi_{j+2} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-m)\times(j+2)}$ by Algorithm 3; set $j = j+2$..
8: **end if**
9: **end while**
10: Compute the QR factorization:
$$\Xi_n^\top = Q_X\begin{bmatrix} R_X^\top & 0\end{bmatrix}^\top = \begin{bmatrix} Q_{1,X} & Q_{2,X}\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} R_X^\top & 0\end{bmatrix}^\top = Q_{1,X}R_X.$$
11: Compute $X_{G,F} = Q_1 Q_{2,X}^\top + Q_2\Xi_n$.
12: Compute $F = R^{-1}Q_1^\top(X_{G,F}S_nP_n^\top - A)$ and $G = R^{-1}Q_1^\top(X_{G,F}T_nP_n^\top - E)$.

be identical to that of those to be placed. Apparently, smaller "*precs*" indicates more accurately computed finite eigenvalues. To reveal the robustness of the closed-loop system, in addition to $\Delta_F^2(A+BF, E+BG)$ in (2) (abbreviated as Δ_F^2 in the following Tables and Figures), the condition number of the closed-loop generalized eigenvectors matrix will also be displayed. Specifically, assume that

$$A + BF = Y\,\mathrm{diag}(\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_n)X,$$
$$E + BG = Y\,\mathrm{diag}(\beta_1,\ldots,\beta_n)X,$$

where $\{(\alpha_1,\beta_1),\ldots,(\alpha_n,\beta_n)\}$ are the eigenvalues, Y and X are nonsingular, the Bauer-Fike type theorem in [32] then shows that $\kappa_F(X) = \|X\|_F\|X^{-1}\|_F$ would measure the sensitivity of the eigenvalues relative to perturbations on the matrix pencil $(A+BF, E+BG)$. When determining the nonsingular $X_{G,F}$ in Section 3.5, it is hoped that $X_{G,F}$ would be well-conditioned. Accordingly, $\kappa_F(X_{G,F})$ is given explicitly for all examples. In addition, $\|F\|_F$ and $\|G\|_F$, representing the energy involved in the feedback control, are also displayed.

All calculations are carried out in MATLAB R2012a, with the machine accuracy represented by $\epsilon \approx 2.2\times 10^{-16}$, on an Intel®Core™i3 dual core 2.27 GHz machine with 2.00 GB RAM.

Example 7 *This illustrative set includes the examples from [5, 11–14, 16, 21, 25, 27, 29, 33, 37, 38], some of which are employed to compare the efficiency of the method proposed in [35] and* `DRSchurS` *here. When assigning the finite poles, we firstly place the finite real poles in non-descendent order, then the finite complex conjugate poles. Tables 1 and 2 present the numerical results, with $\alpha(k)$ representing $\alpha\times 10^k$ for space saving.*

Table 1 shows that `DRSchurS` *produces comparable or occasionally better results than the method proposed in [35]. For Example* 5*, the relative accuracy "precs" produced by* `DRSchurS` *is not that high, probably because some poles are close to the imaginary axis. This is possibly a weakness of our algorithm. Notice also that the numerical results corresponding to Example* 6 *is not that satisfactory, probably due to the difference in magnitudes of the entries in A.* `DRSchurS` *produces nice numerical results for Example* 4 *except for $\kappa_F(X)$, indicating that it may not be wise to access an algorithm on only one criterion.*

For all examples in Table 2, the method put forward in [35] is not tested since it would fail. The reason may be one of the followings — $\lambda(A,E)\cap\mathfrak{L} \neq \emptyset$ or the sizes of the Jordan blocks corresponding to some repeated poles cannot be determined. Note that there are two more rows, in $9'$ *and* $12'$*, in Table 2, which correspond to the inputs in rows* 1 *and* 5*, respectively, but with all finite poles are placed before the infinite ones. Though we cannot prove the feasibility of* `DRSchurS` *when all infinite poles are assigned last, numerical results demonstrate better performance for certain examples. Our method* `DRSchurS` *produces fairly low relative accuracy "precs" and very large $\kappa_F(X)$ for Examples* 13 *and* 18*, both possessing repeated finite poles with algebraic multiplicities greater than m. The treatment of repeated finite poles deserves further investigation.*

Example 8 *This test set contains* 255 *random examples, where $n = 6, 15, 30$, the rank of the singular matrix E equals $2, \lfloor\frac{n}{2}\rfloor, n-1$, and $m = 2, \lfloor\frac{n}{2}\rfloor, n-2$. For each triple $(n, \mathrm{rank}(E), m)$, the number of the finite poles, denoted by r, increases from $\mathrm{rank}([\,E\ B\,]) - m$ to $\mathrm{rank}([\,E\ B\,])$ in increment of* 1*. Note that for randomly generated examples, we usually have $\mathrm{rank}([\,E\ B\,]) = \min\{n, \mathrm{rank}(E)+m\}$, bringing $r = \mathrm{rank}(E), \mathrm{rank}(E)+1, \ldots, \mathrm{rank}(E)+m$ or $r = (n-m), (n-m)+1, \ldots, n$. All examples are generated randomly as follows. For a fixed 4-turple $(n, \mathrm{rank}(E), m, r)$, we first randomly generate five matrices $A, E \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$, $W \in \mathbb{R}^{r\times r}$, $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{r\times r}$ by the MATLAB function* `randn`*, and set the finite poles as $\mathfrak{L}_1 =$* `eig`*(W,Y) and $\mathfrak{L} = \{\underbrace{\infty,\ldots,\infty}_{n-r}, \mathfrak{L}_1\}$. Then compute the QR factorization $E = Q_E R_E$, reset the*

Table 1
Numerical results for Example 7 (compare with the method in [35])

	Method in [35]						DRSchurS					
	precs	Δ_F^2	$\|F\|_F$	$\|G\|_F$	$\kappa_F(Y)$	$\kappa_F(X)$	*precs*	Δ_F^2	$\|F\|_F$	$\|G\|_F$	$\kappa_F(X_{G,F})$	$\kappa_F(X)$
1[21]	−4.1	7.80(0)	1.43(0)	1.09(0)	1.57(0)	3.75(0)	−15.65	2.18(0)	1.71(0)	7.28(−1)	6.11(0)	1.21(1)
2[14]	−12.19	7.55(5)	5.26(2)	1.34(2)	2.19(1)	6.18(1)	−13.49	5.42(0)	3.00(0)	9.95(−1)	6.90(0)	5.80(2)
3[29]	−14.26	6.13(1)	6.24(0)	6.27(0)	1.49(0)	1.15(1)	−14.61	4.23(0)	5.11(0)	2.59(0)	3.12(0)	6.23(0)
4[27]	−9.09	9.52(0)	1.96(−2)	9.20(−3)	1.17(6)	4.88(6)	−11.08	1.75(1)	3.23(0)	2.34(0)	7.95(0)	2.71(4)
5[25]	−6.55	1.78(6)	2.48(1)	6.41(1)	9.72(2)	5.74(0)	−7.34	1.62(1)	9.89(0)	1.59(1)	1.56(2)	4.40(1)
6[25]	−10.63	1.13(8)	5.49(3)	9.65(3)	1.14(1)	3.79(1)	−10.53	3.40(7)	4.67(3)	1.41(3)	4.31(1)	1.47(5)
7[25]	−12.53	8.38(4)	5.54(2)	1.14(3)	5.72(−1)	5.16(−1)	−14.23	5.65(1)	1.18(2)	2.97(1)	1.29(1)	1.11(2)
8[25]	−12.45	1.16(4)	6.77(0)	2.76(1)	2.48(2)	3.34(2)	−14.19	2.31(0)	6.18(0)	5.08(1)	9.22(1)	2.60(1)

Table 2
Numerical results for Example 7

Num.	*precs*	Δ_F^2	$\|F\|_F$	$\|G\|_F$	$\kappa_F(X_{G,F})$	$\kappa_F(X)$
9[11]	−15.86	7.80(−1)	2.16(0)	1.45(0)	3.00(0)	8.38(15)
9′[11]	−17	2.47(−32)	1.58(0)	1.58(0)	3.16(0)	3.00(0)
10[16]	−15.48	2.97(−1)	1.23(0)	1.37(0)	4.09(0)	6.40(0)
11[13]	−15.78	2.80(0)	1.12(0)	1.89(0)	3.00(0)	4.57(0)
12[13]	−8.52	5.03(−1)	1.54(0)	1.12(0)	3.05(0)	1.86(8)
12′[13]	−17.00	5.00(−1)	1.27(0)	1.35(0)	3.06(0)	4.00(0)
13[12]	−5.09	1.18(1)	2.28(0)	4.41(0)	6.76(0)	1.29(11)
14[5]	−15.09	4.67(−1)	4.90(0)	2.39(0)	3.49(0)	3.29(0)
15[33]	−15.48	1.84(0)	1.92(0)	3.32(−2)	4.00(0)	1.53(1)
16[37]	−15.35	2.45(0)	1.89(0)	1.15(0)	4.30(0)	2.79(1)
17[37]	−14.81	2.72(0)	2.88(0)	1.46(0)	6.39(0)	3.06(1)
18[38]	−5.63	9.02(0)	4.41(0)	1.39(0)	6.41(0)	2.12(11)

$(n-\mathrm{rank}(E))\times(n-\mathrm{rank}(E))$ *principal submatrix of* R_E *to* 0*, and reassign* $E = Q_E R_E Q_E^{-1}$*. Taking the resulting* A, E, B *and* $\mathfrak{L}$ *as the inputs, we apply* `DRSchurS`*.*

All numerical results are plotted in the following figures. Specifically, with the triple $(n, \mathrm{rank}(E), m)$ *fixed, the precision of the computed finite poles precs,* Δ_F^2*, the norms of* F *and* G *and the condition numbers of* $X_{G,F}$ *and the generalized eigenvectors matrix* X*, with respect to* r*, are displayed in Fig. 1 to Fig. 6, respectively. For each fixed* n*, the three subfigures correspond to* $m = 2, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ *and* $n-2$*, respectively, where the three different lines match the three distinct* $\mathrm{rank}(E) = 2, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor, n-1$*. The* x*-axis represents* r*, which varies from* $\mathrm{rank}(E)$ *to* $(\mathrm{rank}(E)+m)$ *or* $(n-m)$ *to* n*, and the values on the* y*-axis are mean values over* 50 *trials for a certain 4-turple* $(n, \mathrm{rank}(E), m, r)$*.*

Fig. 1 reveals that `DRSchurS` *can produce high relative accuracy of the assigned finite poles for all the examples except the special case when* $n = 30, \mathrm{rank}(E) = 29, m = 2$*. In that case,* $r = 28, 29, 30$*, and the decline of the relative accuracy can be attributed to the differences between the number of the finite poles and* m*. In addition, when* $\mathrm{rank}(E) = 2$*, the value of precs exhibits an ascending trend with respect to* r*, probably due to the low rank of* E*. As for* Δ_F^2*,* $\|F\|_F$ *and* $\|G\|_F$*, they all display an ascending trend for* $\mathrm{rank}(E) = 2$*, but an oscillatory or a downward trend for* $\mathrm{rank}(E) = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$*,* $n-1$*. It shows that* $\kappa_F(X_{G,F})$ *increases with respect to* r*, probably due to the greater contributions of* S *and* T *to* $X_{G,F}$ *when* r *gets larger; it decreases with respect to* m *since the freedom in* $X_{G,F}$ *increases with respect to* m*.*

5 Conclusions

Based on the remarkable results in [3], a new direct method `DRSchurS` for the *RPA-PDSF* is proposed in this paper. Using the generalized real Schur form of the closed-loop system matrix pencil, `DRSchurS` is capable



Fig. 0. I: $n = 6$



Fig. 0. II: $n = 15$



Fig. 0. III: $n = 30$

Fig. 1. Precision of the assigned finite poles



Fig. 1. I: $n = 6$



Fig. 1. II: $n = 15$



Fig. 1. III: $n = 30$

Fig. 2. Numerical results for Δ_F^2



Fig. 2. I: $n = 6$



Fig. 2. II: $n = 15$



Fig. 2. III: $n = 30$

Fig. 3. Norm of the proportional part F



Fig. 3. I: $n = 6$



Fig. 3. II: $n = 15$



Fig. 3. III: $n = 30$

Fig. 4. Norm of the derivative part G



Fig. 4. I: $n = 6$



Fig. 4. II: $n = 15$



Fig. 4. III: $n = 30$

Fig. 5. Condition number of $X_{G,F}$

of minimizing a robust measure, which is closely related to the departure from normality of the closed-loop system matrix pencil, via some standard eigen-problems. Several numerical examples demonstrate that `DRSchurS` solves *RPA-PDSF*, producing robust closed-loop systems with highly accurate closed-loop finite poles.



Fig. 5. I: $n = 6$



Fig. 5. II: $n = 15$



Fig. 5. III: $n = 30$

Fig. 6. Condition number of X

For future work, we may further investigate the assignment of repeated finite poles, as well as how the freedom in the first eigenvector for the finite poles and the order of poles in $\mathcal{L}$ can be best exploited.

References

[1] E. Assuno, M.C.M. Teixeira, F.A. Faria, N.A.P. Da Silva and R. Cardim, "Robust state-derivative feedback LMI-based designs for multivariable linear systems", *International Journal of Control*, 80(2007), 1260–1270.

[2] A. Bunse-Gerstner, R. Byers, V. Mehrmann and N.K. Nichols, "Feedback design for regularizing descriptor systems", *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 299(1999), 119-151.

[3] A. Bunse-Gerstner, V. Mehrmann and N.K. Nichols, "Regularization of descriptor systems by derivative and proportional state feedback", *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 13(1992), 46–67.

[4] R. Byers, T. Geerts and V. Mehrmann, "Descriptor systems without controllability at infinity", *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 35(1997), 462–479.

[5] M. Chaabane, O. Bachelier, M. Souissi and D. Mehdi, "Stability and stabilization of continuous descriptor systems: an LMI approach", *Mathematical Problems in Engineering*, (2006)2006, 1–15.

[6] D.L. Chu, H.C. Chan and D.W.C. Ho, "Regularization of singular systems by derivative and proportional output feedback", *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 19(1998), 21–38.

[7] D.L. Chu and D.W.C. Ho, "Infinite eigenvalue assignment for singular systems", *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 298(1999), 21–37.

[8] E.K.-W. Chu, "Pole assignment via the schur form", *Systems & Control Letters*, 56(2007), 303–314.

[9] L. Dai, *Singular Control Systems*, Springer-Verlag Berlin, Heidelberg, 1989.

[10] G.R.Duan, "On the solution to Sylvester matrix equation AV+ BW= EVF", *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 41(1996), 2490–2494.

[11] G.R.Duan, "Eigenstructure assignment and response analysis in descriptor linear systems with state feedback control", *International Journal of Control*, 69(1998), 663–694.

[12] G.R. Duan and R.J. Patton, "Eigenstructure assignment in descriptor systems via proportional plus derivative state feedback", *International Journal of Control*, 68(1997), 1147–1162.

[13] G.R. Duan and R.J. Patton, "Eigenstructure assignment in descriptor systems via state feedback-a new complete parametric approach", *International Journal of Control*, 29(1998), 167–178.

[14] G.R. Duan and R.J. Patton, "Robust pole assignment in descriptor systems via proportional plus partial derivative state feedback", *International Journal of Control*, 72(1999), 1193–1203.

[15] L. Elsner and J.G. Sun, "Perturbation theorems for the generalized eigenvalue problem", *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 48(1982), 341–357.

[16] L.R. Fletcher, "Eigenstructure assignment by output feedback in descriptor systems", *IEE Proceedings D on Control Theory and Applications*, 135(1988), 302–308.

[17] L. Fletcher, J. Kautsky and N.K.Nichols, "Eigenstructure assignment in descriptor systems", *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 31(1986), 1138–1141.

[18] Z.C. Guo, Y.F. Cai, J. Qian and S.F. Xu, "A modified Schur method for robust pole assignment in state feedback control", *Automatica*, 52(2015), 334–339.

[19] M. Hou, "Controllability and elimination of impulsive modes in descriptor systems", *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 49(2004), 1723–1729.

[20] J.Y. Ishihara and M.H. Terra, "Impulse controllability and observability of rectangular descriptor systems", *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 46(2001), 991–994.

[21] J. Kautsky, N.K. Nichols and E.K.-W. Chu, "Robust pole assignment in singular control systems", *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 121(1989), 9–37.

[22] V. Kuera and P. Zagalak, "Fundamental theorem of state feedback for singular systems", *Automatica*, 24(1988), 653–658.

[23] A. Kumar and P. Daoutidis, *Control of Nonlinear Differential Algebraic Equation Systems with Applications to Chemical Processes*, CRC Press, 1999.

[24] F.L. Lewis, "A survey of linear singular systems", *Circuits, Systems and Signal Processing*, 5(1986), 3–36.

[25] T. Li and E.K.-W. Chu, "A Schur-Newton algorithm for robust pole assignment of descriptor systems", *Taiwanese Journal of Mathematics*, 12(2008), 1805–1825.

[26] D.G. Luenberger, "Dynamic equations in descriptor form", *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 22(1977), 312–321.

[27] G. Miminis, "Deflation in eigenvalue assignment of descriptor systems using state feedback", *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 38(1993), 1322–1336.

[28] K. Ozcaldiran and F.L. Lewis, "On the regularizability of singular systems", *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 35(1990), 1156–1160.

[29] J. Ren and Q. Zhang, "Positive real control for descriptor systems with uncertainties in the derivative matrix via a proportional plus derivative feedback", *International Journal of Systems Science*, 44(2013), 450-460.

[30] R. Riaza, *Differential-Algebraic Systems: Analytical Aspects and Circuit Applications*, World Scientific, 2008.

[31] M.A. Shayman, "Pole placement by dynamic compensation for descriptor systems", *Automatica*, 24(1988), 279–282.

[32] G.W. Stewart and J.G. Sun, *Matrix Perturbation Theory*, Academic Press, New York, 1990.

[33] V.L. Syrmos and F.L. Lewis, "Robust eigenvalue assignment for generalized systems", *Automatica*, 28(1992), 1223–1228.

[34] P.M. Van Dooren, "The generalized eigenstructure problem in linear system theory", *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 26(1981), 111–129.

[35] A. Varga, "A numerically reliable approach to robust pole assignment for descriptor systems", *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 19(2003), 1221–1230.

[36] E.L. Yip and R.F. Sincovec, "Solvability, controllability, and observability of continuous descriptor systems", *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 26(1981), 702–707.

[37] B. Zhang, "Eigenvalue assignment in linear descriptor systems via output feedback", *IET Control Theory & Applications*, 7(2013), 1906–1913.

[38] B. Zhang, "Parametric eigenstructure assignment for descriptor systems via proportional plus derivative state feedback", *International Journal of Control, Automation, and Systems*, 9(2011), 15–22.